

bulletin

VOL. XII, No. 29

October 29, 1959

THE UNITED STATES—A CHALLENGE TO BETTER
WORLDWIDE ECONOMIC & POLITICAL Progress . . . 648

THE STATE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY . . .
by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. . . . 649

THE UNITED STATES AND AMERICAN SECURITY . . .
by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. . . . 652

THE PRESIDENT OF GREAT BRITAIN: A REFLECTION OF
THE "COMMONWEALTH" by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. . . . 671

THE UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
FROM THE UNITED STATES by Joseph A. Parnham . . . 686



For complete contents see back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXI, No. 539 • PUBLICATION 3661

October 31, 1949

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$6, foreign \$8.50
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (February 18, 1949).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

WORKING IN THE U.N.—A CHALLENGE TO BETTER HUMAN RELATIONS

Address by President Truman¹

PRESIDENT ROMULO, MR. LIE, DISTINGUISHED REPRESENTATIVES, AND FELLOW GUESTS: We have come together to lay the cornerstone of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations. These are the most important buildings in the world, for they are the center of man's hope for peace and a better life. This is the place where the nations of the world will work together to make that hope a reality.

This occasion is a source of special pride to the people of the United States. We are deeply conscious of the honor of having the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in this country. At the same time, we know how important it is that the people of other nations should come to know at first hand the work of this world organization. We consider it appropriate, therefore, that the United Nations should hold meetings from time to time in other countries when that can be done. For the United Nations must draw its inspiration from the people of every land; it must be truly representative of and responsive to the peoples of the world whom it was created to serve.

Significance of U.N. Day

This ceremony marks a new stage in the growth of the United Nations. It is fitting that it should take place on United Nations Day, the fourth anniversary of the day the Charter entered into effect. During the four years of its existence, this

¹ Made on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the Secretariat Building of the permanent United Nations Headquarters in New York City on Oct. 24, 1949, and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

organization has become a powerful force for promoting peace and friendship among the peoples of the world. The construction of this new headquarters is tangible proof of the steadfast faith of the members in the vitality and strength of the organization, and of our determination that it shall become more and more effective in the years ahead.

The Charter embodies the hopes and ideals of men everywhere. Hopes and ideals are not static. They are dynamic, and they give life and vigor to the United Nations. We look forward to a continuing growth and evolution of the organization to meet the changing needs of the world's peoples. We hope that eventually every nation on earth will be a fully qualified and loyal member.

We who are close to the United Nations sometimes forget that it is more than the procedures, the councils, and the debates, through which it operates. We tend to overlook the fact that the organization is the living embodiment of the principles of the Charter—the renunciation of aggression and the joint determination to build a better life.

But if we overlook this fact, we will fail to realize the strength and power of the United Nations. We will fail to understand the true nature of this new force that has been created in the affairs of our time.

A World Compact

The United Nations is essentially an expression of the moral nature of man's aspirations. The Charter clearly shows our determination that international problems must be settled on a basis acceptable to the conscience of mankind.

Because the United Nations is the dynamic expression of what all the peoples of the world desire, because it sets up a standard of right and justice for all nations, it is greater than any of its members. The compact that underlies the United Nations cannot be ignored—and it cannot be infringed or dissolved.

We in the United States, in the course of our own history, have learned what it means to set up an organization to give expression to the common desire for peace and unity. Our Constitution expressed the will of the people that there should be a United States. And through toil and struggle the people made their will prevail.

In the same way, I think, the Charter and the organization served by these buildings express the will of the people of the world that there shall be a United Nations.

This does not mean that all the member countries are of one mind on all issues. The controversies which divide us go very deep. We should understand that these buildings are not a monument to the unanimous agreement of nations on all things. But they signify one new and important fact. They signify that the peoples of the world are of one mind in their determination to solve their common problems by working together.

Social and Economic Forces

Our success in the United Nations will be measured not only in terms of our ability to meet and master political controversies. We have learned that political controversies grow out of social and economic problems. If the people of the world are to live together in peace, we must work together to establish the conditions that will provide a firm foundation for peace.

For this reason, our success will also be measured by the extent to which the right of individual human beings are realized. And it will be measured by the extent of our economic and social progress.

These fundamental facts are recognized both in the language of the Charter and in the activities in which the United Nations has been engaged during the past four years. The Charter plainly makes respect for human rights by nations a matter of international concern. The member nations have learned from bitter experience that regard for human rights is indispensable to political, economic, and social progress. They have learned that disregard of human rights is the beginning

of tyranny and, too often, the beginning of war.

For these reasons, the United Nations has devoted much of its time to fostering respect for human rights. The General Assembly has adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on Genocide. Other important measures in this field are under study.

I am confident that this great work will go steadily forward. The preparation of a Covenant on Human Rights by the Human Rights Commission is a task with which the United States is deeply concerned. We believe strongly that the attainment of basic civil and political rights for men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or religion—is essential to the peace we are seeking. We hope that the Covenant on Human Rights will contain effective provisions regarding freedom of information. The minds of men must be free from artificial and arbitrary restraints in order that they may seek the truth and apply their intelligence to the making of a better world.

Another field in which the United Nations is undertaking to build the foundations of a peaceful world is that of economic development. Today, at least half of mankind lives in dire poverty. Hundreds of millions of men, women, and children lack adequate food, clothing, and shelter. We cannot achieve permanent peace and prosperity in the world until the standard of living in underdeveloped areas is raised.

It is for this reason that I have urged the launching of a vigorous and concerted effort to apply modern technology and capital investment to improve the lot of these peoples. These areas need a large expansion of investment and trade. In order for this to take place, they also need the application of scientific knowledge and technical skills to their basic problems—producing more food, improving health and sanitation, making use of their natural resources, and educating their people.

To meet these needs, the United Nations and its agencies are preparing a detailed program for technical assistance to underdeveloped areas.

The Economic and Social Council last summer defined the basic principles which should underlie this program. The General Assembly is now completing and perfecting the initial plans. The fact that the Economic Committee of the Assembly voted unanimously for the resolution on technical assistance shows that this is a common cause which commands united support. Although differences may arise over details of the program, I fervently

hope that the members of the United Nations will remain unanimous in their determination to raise the standards of living of the less fortunate members of the human family.

The United States intends to play its full part in this great enterprise. We are already carrying on a number of activities in this field. I shall urge the Congress, when it reconvenes in January, to give high priority to proposals which will make possible additional technical assistance and capital investment.

Majority Atomic Energy Plan

I should like to speak of one other problem which is of major concern to the United Nations. That is the control of atomic energy.

Ever since the first atomic weapon was developed, a major objective of United States policy has been a system of international control of atomic energy that would assure effective prohibition of atomic weapons, and at the same time would promote the peaceful use of atomic energy by all nations.

In November 1945, Prime Minister Attlee of the United Kingdom, Prime Minister King of Canada, and I agreed that the problem of international control of atomic energy should be referred to the United Nations. The establishment of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission was one of the first acts of the first session of the General Assembly.

That Commission worked for three years on the problem. It developed a plan of control which reflected valuable contributions by almost every country represented on the Commission. This plan of control was overwhelmingly approved by the General Assembly on November 4, 1948.

This is a good plan. It is a plan that can work, and more important, it is a plan that can be effective in accomplishing its purpose. It is the only plan so far developed that would meet the technical requirements of control, that would make prohibition of atomic weapons effective, and at the same time promote the peaceful development of atomic energy on a cooperative basis.

We support this plan and will continue to support it unless and until a better and more effective plan is put forward. To assure that atomic energy will be devoted to man's welfare and not to his destruction is a continuing challenge to all nations

and all peoples. The United States is now, and will remain, ready to do its full share in meeting this challenge.

Goals in Human Relations

Respect for human rights, promotion of economic development, and a system for control of weapons are requisites to the kind of world we seek. We cannot solve these problems overnight, but we must keep everlastingly working at them in order to reach our goal.

No single nation can always have its own way, for these are human problems, and the solution of human problems is to be found in negotiation and mutual adjustment.

The challenge of the twentieth century is the challenge of human relations, and not of impersonal natural forces. The real dangers confronting us today have their origins in outmoded habits of thought, in the inertia of human nature, and in preoccupation with supposed national interests to the detriment of the common good.

As members of the United Nations, we are convinced that patience, the spirit of reasonableness, and hard work will solve the most stubborn political problems. We are convinced that individual rights and social and economic progress can be advanced through international cooperation.

Our faith is in the betterment of human relations. Our vision is of a better world in which men and nations can live together, respecting one another's rights and cooperating in building a better life for all. Our efforts are made in the belief that men and nations can cooperate, that there are no international problems which men of good will cannot solve or adjust.

Mr. President, Mr. Lie, the laying of this cornerstone is an act of faith—our unshakable faith that the United Nations will succeed in accomplishing the great tasks for which it was created.

But "faith without works is dead." We must make our devotion to the ideals of the Charter as strong as the steel in this building. We must pursue the objectives of the Charter with resolution as firm as the rock on which this building rests. We must conduct our affairs foursquare with the Charter, in terms as true as this cornerstone.

If we do these things, the United Nations will endure and will bring the blessings of peace and well-being to mankind.

WHAT DOES INTERNATIONAL STANDARDIZATION MEAN TO THE UNITED STATES?

by Joseph A. Greenwald¹

The best way to explain what international standardization means to the United States is to describe our economic foreign policy and how international standardization can contribute to that policy.

After two world wars and a number of world depressions, we realize that neither political nor economic isolationism is possible for the United States. The United States must recognize its economic leadership and must be prepared to do its part in reestablishing sound economic conditions throughout the world. At the American Legion Convention this year the President said, "World prosperity is necessary to world peace. Furthermore, world prosperity is necessary to our own prosperity in the United States." Our foreign economic policy will promote our national prosperity in the long run through the restoration of the economy of Europe and other war-devastated areas and through the revival of world trade. It will also result in many direct and immediate political and economic benefits. We are determined to avoid the dangerous and self-defeating policies of economic nationalism.

Economic Objectives

By greatly oversimplifying it, our economic foreign policy can be reduced to two objectives: (1) increasing world production and (2) reducing barriers to trade. To achieve these objectives, the United States has taken the lead in building the United Nations and its specialized agencies, par-

ticularly the International Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the proposed International Trade Organization. The United States also initiated action to reduce tariffs reciprocally through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and to help put Europe on its feet through the European Recovery Program. The proposed technical assistance program for underdeveloped areas, based on Point 4 of the President's inaugural address, is designed to promote a progressive rise in standards of living throughout the world, which is our best insurance of a peaceful future.

It is felt that our ultimate foreign policy objectives can be achieved by promoting the free flow of goods across national borders in ever increasing quantities. The economic destruction and dislocation resulting from the war makes it necessary to take certain steps toward restoring the productive capacity of our friendly neighbors along with our efforts to reduce barriers to trade. In the underdeveloped areas, we must help the people learn modern agricultural and industrial methods to enable them to make an increased contribution to an expanding world economy and a balanced world trade. Thus the European Recovery Program and the proposed Point 4 program are essential parts of our economic foreign policy. It is obviously impossible to carry on trade which implies an exchange of goods when one of the parties has most of the goods. Consequently, we must assist other nations in increasing their production. As these programs become successful and as foreign goods compete with ours, the benefits of these programs to the United States may appear obscure. We may even be accused of "cutting our own throats."

¹ An address delivered at the annual meeting of the American Standard Association in New York, N. Y., on Oct. 13, 1949.

Justification of the Aid Programs

In justification of these programs, it has been pointed out that we are dependent upon foreign countries for many vital minerals and other raw materials. It is stated that without foreign trade, many of our industries would suffer. It is also argued that we need to sell many things abroad; that we must have foreign markets for our cotton, wheat, and tobacco; and that our prosperity would be seriously damaged if the export of our products were cut off. To these arguments should be added one based on the traditional principles of a free enterprise economy. Rather than thinking of our programs for increasing production abroad as something which will ultimately result in competition for United States producers, it should be remembered that human wishes and desires are infinite. Advertising, moreover, is constantly creating new desires. It should be possible, therefore, to have a continuously expanding world trade.

The need for thinking in terms of the indefinite expandability of consumers' wishes cannot be emphasized too strongly. The American system of free competitive enterprise is not based upon the theory of the mature or contracting economy. One can be optimistic enough to believe that when the wartime backlog of demand for durable goods has been exhausted, American industry, operating under a profit motive, will not rely upon the replacement demand, but will develop new products which American and foreign consumers will purchase. In many cases these new products will be improvements on old ideas, such as ball point pens. In other cases, the innovation may be something like the automobile, which will in turn start off a tremendous chain of allied products and industries. The future expansion of trade and production will very likely be in the area of many of the products and devices now used by Buck Rogers. Raising production and standards of living in underdeveloped areas will introduce the people in these areas to new products and give them the effective purchasing power with which to buy them.

Reduction of Trade Barriers

In encouraging the reduction of barriers to international trade, the United States is founding its policy upon the basic philosophy which has enabled it to achieve the greatest level of production in history. We are convinced that a system of free competitive enterprise is the best way of promoting the general welfare of people

throughout the world and preserving to them the benefits of democracy. Under this system the decisions regarding what is to be produced are made by the impartial forces of the market. The freedom derived from this system could be called the "freedom of choice"—a freedom characterized by the democratic process of "one dollar—one vote." The benefits of specialization are lost when artificial barriers, whether private or governmental, distort the production pattern which would be established in a free competitive system. Furthermore, where these barriers limit production or trade, the decisions are taken out of the hands of the voter or consumer with dollars, and his freedom of choice is restricted.

Competition and Standardization in Trade

The postwar trend has been away from free enterprise and free trade. Competition is generally considered something which came and went with Adam Smith. But 23 nations adhered to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which provides a mechanism for reducing governmental barriers to trade, and a number of European countries have begun to investigate the effect of private restrictive business practices and cartels upon national productivity. International standardization can help in restoring some degree of competition in international trade.

Aid of Standardization to American Business

In implementing United States foreign economic policy through international standardization, the benefits will accrue not only on the rather idealistic level of promoting world peace and prosperity, but also on the dollar-and-cents level of increasing American foreign trade. For example, the well-known case of the international unification of sound track location on 16 mm. sound film has made it possible for the American motion picture industry to sell its products abroad. In this case the benefits were equally important in the field of ideas, because we have been able, through American motion pictures, to present our way of life in every corner of the earth. The adoption of different television standards in various countries may impede the flow of ideas through this new medium as well as impede the sale of television sets across national borders. And different electrical voltages and cycles continue to make use of American electrical appliances abroad difficult.

Standardization Techniques in World Production

With respect to our foreign economic policy objective of increasing world production, the report of the second session of the Anglo-American Council on Productivity is significant. It is the view of the Council that low cost production and high productivity can be obtained only by utilizing standardization, specialization, and simplification procedures and methods. The adoption of standardization techniques would be a great factor in reestablishing the European economy on a self-supporting basis. In connection with the Technical Assistance Program for underdeveloped areas, standardization is equally important, but the emphasis is different. In providing assistance to these countries, attention will be directed primarily toward the basic problems of agriculture, public health, and resource development. Here the question of inspection and grading is important in the development of markets. For example, Liberia produces palm oil which is an essential strategic material used in the production of steel. The United States steel industry, however, finds palm oil from Liberia unsatisfactory because of its low quality. Thus there is a need for inspection and grading procedures in Liberia which we hope will bring up the quality of Liberian palm oil. Our economic mission in Liberia is assisting the Liberian Government in establishing a grading and inspection service. A more basic requirement in many of the underdeveloped countries is the establishment of uniform standards of weight and measurement. It is hoped that these standardization techniques will be part of the American know-how which we will transmit to the industrially backward countries of the world.

International Standards and International Trade

International standardization can play an even more important role in achieving our objective of reducing barriers to and smoothing the flow of international trade. The lack of international standards often results in the exclusion of certain goods from a particular market where the national standards of the consuming country differ from the standards or practice in the producing country. This situation is most undesirable where the national standards are made compulsory by the government of that country. A current example of this type of situation is the problem met by Ameri-

can automobile manufacturers in marketing cars with sealed beam headlights in Europe and, conversely, the difficulty encountered by British automobile manufacturers attempting to sell in certain states in the United States. Standards can also be used to obstruct international trade when they are adopted by organizations and private manufacturers to exclude the products of other manufacturers from a certain area. However, I am sure that these cases are not very numerous and they constitute abuses of standardization and its principles.

Effect of Standardization on Sales of American Products

On the other hand, effective international standardization can open up wider markets for American products. By the adoption of dimensional standards the problem of replacement parts and the use of allied products will no longer act as a deterrent to foreign purchasing. Inspection and certification procedures will instill confidence on the part of foreign buyers and encourage sales in new markets. The adoption of international standards of quality and standards of fitness for purpose or performance will also serve to make it easier to sell goods in international trade. Standardization also enables the buyer and seller to speak the same language. It promotes fairness in competition and puts tenders on a comparable basis in international trade. In the field of scientific and technological research, standardization is also important in connection with libraries, documentation, and the adoption of uniform terms, definitions, and symbols. Standard methods of sampling and testing are important for research as well as trade.

Since international standardization is almost in the same category as virtue, that is, most people are in favor of it, it should not be necessary to exhort people to participate in international standardization projects. However, like virtue, everyone agrees that it is a good thing, especially for their neighbors, but not everyone takes positive steps to do something about it. In pointing out the advantages that will flow from achieving the objectives of our economic foreign policy and in indicating the role of international standardization in implementing that policy, the desirability of taking active steps to achieve international standardization should be clear.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

U.S. Urges System of Verification in Control of International Armaments

Statement by Ambassador Warren R. Austin¹

There is a grave responsibility on all of us as members of this Council to guard against deluding the peoples of the world by our discussions here on the subject of disarmament. It is not so important to find who is at fault, as it is to correct misunderstanding.

Disarmament is not an easy business or a simple business. It is a cruelty and a fraud to make it appear that it is.

Anyone who is thinking scientifically about disarmament knows that it is wholly impossible of achievement unless it is approached gradually and on a basis of orderly and systematic evolution.

We have heard much involved discussion about the necessity of developing conditions of world confidence before disarming and, conversely, disarming in order to engender conditions of world confidence. Actually the problem is not as circular as it may seem. It is rather the problem of the infant who must learn to crawl before he can walk and leap. It is playing fast and loose with the hopes and aspirations of men to make them think that by some magic we can transform ourselves instantly from knights to bishops.

Our Soviet colleagues profess a great impatience about this matter of disarmament. They have charged over and over again that the separation of atomic weapons from all other weapons for separate treatment in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Conventional Armaments Commission was deliberately planned and engineered to bring about a blockage against progress in both fields. They have proposed an across-the-board disarmament of one-third of the armaments and armed forces of the five permanent members of the Security Council without any indication of how such a hit-and-miss scheme would be accomplished and with

almost complete indifference as to the necessity of obtaining authentic and verified data concerning the armaments and armed forces to be thus arbitrarily divided. They have scoffed at the French census and verification proposals which we have now before us as an idle divertissement from the real task of immediate and effective disarmament.²

But how can these things all be accomplished at once? Have the Soviets some magic formula by which they can do many things at one and the same time? If so, they have certainly kept it completely to themselves if they are to be judged on the record of their performances in the Atomic Energy Commission and in the Commission for Conventional Armaments.

Let us consider for a moment the objection which they have made the core of all of their arguments in the Commission for Conventional Armaments—the separation of the field of atomic energy and atomic weapons for consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission from the field of conventional armaments and armed forces which was turned

¹ Made before the Security Council on Oct. 14, 1949, and released to the press by the U. S. Mission to the United Nations on the same date.

² The text of the French resolution of Oct. 14 (S/1408/rev. 1) states:

"The Security Council recognizes as an essential part of any effective system of disarmament the submission by states of full information on conventional armaments and armed forces together with adequate procedures for complete verification of such information.

"As regards the principle of submitting information on atomic weapons, the Council recalls that the submission of full information on atomic material and facilities, including atomic weapons, is an integral part of the United Nations plan of control and prohibition approved by the General Assembly on November 4, 1948, to ensure the use of atomic energy only for peaceful purposes and to ensure effective prohibition of atomic weapons."

over to the Commission for Conventional Armaments. How would it have been possible for one and the same body at one and the same time to have considered together the widely dissimilar problems of these two fields? Surely there can be no question but what the assignment of these two phases of the total disarmament problem to one commission would have required a division of the problem into its two principal parts and the formation of subcommittees to deal with them separately. Any attempt to deal with them together simultaneously would have resulted in utter confusion and would have left us today far short of the substantial progress which has already been achieved in the atomic field and the more limited progress attained in the area of conventional armaments and armed forces.

I do not say that the blocking of this progress was the objective toward which our Soviet colleagues were striving. What I do call upon them to demonstrate, however, is how the work of either the Atomic Energy Commission or the Conventional Armaments Commission has in any way been hampered by the separation of the one from the other.

This is one of the principal areas in which the peoples of the world have become thoroughly confused. They do not understand jurisdictional distinctions, and they are not especially interested in trying to understand them. But they do understand the importance of one person or one body trying to do only one thing at a time, and they do understand the importance of taking first things first.

Those were the considerations which led the General Assembly to take up as one of the first items of its business in the First General Assembly of January 1946 the establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission to work out a system for the control of atomic energy to insure its use only for peaceful purposes and for the elimination of atomic weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. That decision of the General Assembly was a unanimous decision, and the proof of its wisdom is seen clearly in the events which have transpired in the nearly 4 years which have elapsed since it was made.

The Soviet representatives have tried to argue that this division of the armaments field between two commissions was deliberately brought about simply to make it possible to play the inaction of one commission off against the other. The complete refutation of this argument lies in the outstanding achievement of the Atomic Energy Commission in evolving a complete and effective plan of control of atomic energy and elimination of atomic weapons—a plan which has met with the acceptance and approval of the overwhelming majority of the member states of the United Nations. This is a record of action, not inaction—a record which could not have been achieved had the prob-

lems of the atomic field been commingled and confused with the wholly different problems in the field of conventional armaments.

The Atomic Energy Commission had more than a year's head start on the Commission for Conventional Armaments. The record of its achievement is, therefore, a greater one. But the Conventional Armaments Commission has made progress of its own as we have witnessed here in our recent consideration of the Commission's second progress report and as we are now witnessing further in our consideration of the French census and verification proposals. Here again it is doubtful if even this admittedly limited progress could have been achieved had the two fields been merged together for single treatment.

We have recognized from the very beginning that the two fields are intimately related to each other—that they are two parts or phases of the single over-all problem of disarmament. But we have insisted that the only way in which any orderly progress could be achieved was to deal with the quite different problems of the two fields in parallel fashion rather than in the complex mixture the Soviet has been contending for.

I wish to emphasize that the problem of the control of atomic energy and the prohibition of atomic weapons is of an entirely different nature from the problem of the regulation and reduction of conventional armaments. Atomic energy poses a new and unique problem to the world. The nuclear fuels used or produced in atomic energy plants are the same nuclear explosives used in atomic weapons. Their conversion from one to the other could take place rapidly and without warning. Therefore, controls over such plants must be of an entirely different nature, which are neither necessary nor desirable in the field of conventional armaments.

The dispute is not one of technical niceties. It is one based on considerations of common sense and common experience. It is simply a matter of taking one thing at a time in order to get something done. In their efforts to make out of it some sinister plot by the majority, the Soviet representatives have been trying to muddy the waters so that they will fail to reflect clearly the true Soviet countenance, which is one of complete opposition to any real plan of effective disarmament.

The same attitude has been evidenced by the Soviet in advancing their one-third disarmament proposal and in their opposition to the census and verification proposals presently pending before us. They charge that these latter proposals have been brought up as a diversion and distraction from the real business of disarmament. They would impatiently brush them aside as an irrelevance.

But you can not disarm first and then agree on a plan of disarmament. That is what they would have us do. They might as well suggest that we build a house and then hire an architect to draw up the plans for the house.

To be well-built, the house of disarmament must be built carefully according to well thought-out plans and firmly on strong foundations. We do no service to the world or to ourselves to rush into haphazard constructions without plans of validity and materials of tested strength.

For honest and effective disarmament in the field of atomic energy and atomic weapons we have a well-considered plan—the plan approved by the overwhelming majority of the United Nations at the Third General Assembly last fall. It is to this plan that we direct the attention of all who would seek an answer to the baseless charge of the Soviet representative in his statement here a few days ago when he asserted that “the leading circles of the United States of America have bent all efforts to prevent the prohibition of the atomic weapons from being adopted and to exclude the collection of information on this weapon.”

Similarly, in the field of conventional armaments and armed forces, the census and verification proposals advanced by the French and approved by the Commission for Conventional Armaments represent an honest and effective step in the direction of the development of a plan for disarmament comparable to that which has already been developed for the atomic field. They are, it is true, a long way from an actual plan of disarmament and they are not put forward, as the Soviet representative has charged, as any substitute for such a plan. But they are a beginning and an honest beginning, and anyone who is sincerely in favor of disarmament can not help but support them.

In its avowed eagerness to get ahead rapidly with the business of disarmament how can the Soviet oppose them? Can it be because they provide for a tight and effective system of verification which will insure accurate results; a system of verification which has been significantly absent from every single proposal advanced by the Soviet, including its most recent proposal advanced here at the conclusion of our last meeting?

The United States Government has supported the French census and verification proposals in the Commission for Conventional Armaments,

and it is supporting them here in the Security Council, precisely because after careful and prolonged study they have been found to be constructive proposals, constituting a bona fide response to the request of the General Assembly in its resolution of November 19, 1948. The United States recognizes what these proposals entail in the system of inspection and checking for which they provide. We are willing to submit ourselves to such a system of inspection and checking. We do not feel sensitive about it or regard that its being called for is any reflection upon our integrity or our sovereignty.

If the Soviet's impatience with the slowness of progress toward disarmament is genuine, there is an obvious means by which it can insure that the process is speeded up. Let them accept these census and verification proposals as a first step and then let us together go forward with the business laid out for the Commission for Conventional Armaments. We are ready to go forward just as swiftly as they, provided we are traveling together on a road that leads to disarmament. But we refuse to set out upon a blind alley with them.

We of the United Nations are indebted to the French for their careful painstaking work in blazing the beginning of a trail with their census and verification proposals. We are further indebted to them for illuminating the trail for us by the draft resolution which they have just introduced to meet the glaring inadequacies of the resolution put forward by the Soviet representative last Tuesday.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate the necessity of keeping the peoples of the world clear as to what is going on in the work of the United Nations toward disarmament. They cannot be reminded too often that there is no quick and easy short cut to disarmament. They must not be deluded by those who would make it appear that there is such a way.

What a vast relief it would be if we in the United Nations could make possible some reduction in the heavy expenditures for armaments necessary for world security.

The census and verification proposals would advance us toward that objective. The United States Government will support these proposals as contained in the draft resolution submitted by the distinguished representative of France.

The United Nations and American Security

*by Deputy Under Secretary Rusk*¹

It is particularly fitting that the Department of State bring back to the birthplace of the United Nations a report on some of its accomplishments and some of its tribulations. It can be only a partial account. The United Nations has long since outrun the possibilities of a single speech, article or report, a single motion picture or book. Therein lies a major problem. If the United Nations is to accomplish what is expected of it under the Charter, it must be strongly supported by the peoples of its member states. But if people are to support it, they must know about it and understand its work. But we have learned that the day-to-day constructive work of thousands of United Nations men and women around the world is not news, commands no headlines, attracts no attention. Peacemaking is not as dramatic as war making. The telling of the story of the United Nations is becoming increasingly essential and increasingly impossible.

To say that the United Nations is 4 years old can no longer be a plea that this minor child is not somehow fully responsible for its performance. The United Nations is a public institution whose organization is now substantially complete; it must justify its existence and its claim to our loyalties and resources in the same way as must other institutions—by performance—by efficient, effective, and productive performance. Its friends do it no service in pretending that its youth is an alibi.

I have elected to speak here in San Francisco on "The United Nations and American Security." I did so because I felt that in this city which has a special relationship to the United Nations, it would be proper to try to get at the heart of the matter and to assess this world organization against its severest test. The United Nations will stand or fall as it is able to maintain the peace. The organization arose out of a world-

wide coalition against Axis aggression. The maintenance of international peace and security is the dominant theme of the Charter. With peace, the governments and peoples of the United Nations will at least have a chance to get on with the economic, social, humanitarian, and legal objectives outlined in the Charter, objectives which are both important in themselves and aimed at removing some of the basic causes of war. If a major war breaks out, the United Nations will be shaken to its foundations and its very existence comes into question. The United Nations must face the fact that it must preserve the peace—or else. But here we discover that we are saying no more than that the United Nations must face the major test which confronts the human race itself. We must preserve the peace—or else.

Obligations of Membership

Before we turn to the work of the United Nations in the security field, we should note that it is an organization which has little existence beyond its member governments. Decisions are made by members. Its resolutions are carried out, if they are carried out, by its members. The action which might be taken by the Security Council or by the Assembly in any given situation depends upon the willingness of the members to take action. I do not believe that there is a single case where the Charter has prevented the United Nations from taking the action necessary to maintain the peace. The Charter has allowed all that its members have been willing to do. There is unlimited flexibility within the Charter for further growth; we have not begun to occupy the wide reaches of the Charter in our search for sanity in international relations. When we speak of the United Nations, therefore, we are speaking of ourselves as a leading member—and of other governments and peoples who make it up. If we point a finger at the United Nations, to credit it with success or charge it with failure, remember that we are also pointing at ourselves.

¹An address delivered before the Commonwealth Club of California on the occasion of United Nations Week in San Francisco, Calif. on Oct. 21, 1949, and released to the press on the same date.

How is the United Nations going about the business of preventing war?

Standards of Conduct

First, it has established in the Charter a high standard of conduct for its members. The ringing phrases of the Charter are not merely an expression of lofty aspiration and sentiment—they are obligations upon governments. Within them we find guides for the further advancement of the race—and with them we also find the minimum standards which must be met if we are to have peace.

All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means.

All Members shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

These compelling propositions apply to all, large and small, European or Asiatic, Communist, Socialist or capitalist, free and totalitarian, powerful and weak. Our primary question is: How are we to live at peace with each other despite our great differences in political organization, economic theory, or social objectives; how to live at peace despite the differences of race and religion or ancient animosity, despite incredible wealth and unbelievable poverty, despite self-conscious independence or the irritations of foreign rule? The charter tells us: Settle your disputes by peaceful means and don't threaten or use force against the territory or the independence of others. Simple propositions designed to surmount differences and to build a peace.

It is interesting to note that the standards of the Charter are publicly acknowledged by all the members, without exception, as the measure of national conduct. Members may differ sharply, may charge each other with the most serious offenses, may debate bitterly what the Charter means and how it should be applied to specific cases. But thus far, each member has sought to defend its case in terms of compliance with the Charter, however farfetched some of us may think such an effort becomes. No delegation has yet come forward to deal cynically in debate with the Charter itself, an interesting acknowledgement of the moral ascendancy of the Charter and its hold upon the minds of men throughout the world.

Even Mr. Vyshinsky, upon arrival in New York, stated:

"The Soviet Delegation feels confident that the United Nations is—as the head of the Soviet Government, Stalin, had said—a serious instrument for the maintenance of peace and international security. There can be no doubt that the General

Assembly will be able to solve successfully the important tasks it faces, provided that the members display a sincere desire to cooperate with each other and act in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter."

I suggest that, despite our fear that Mr. Vyshinsky didn't mean it and that the conduct of his government would hardly bear him out, nevertheless it is a very good thing that he and his colleagues feel compelled to frame their propaganda within the concepts of the Charter. It is true that we have witnessed attempts to seize and distort our most respectable words such as "democracy," "peace," the "will of the people." But, on balance, I believe we gain; for I do not believe that the Russian people can be persuaded forever that aggression is peace, that tyranny is democracy, that falsehood is truth, and that suppression is freedom. 1984 is not here yet.

I know, from direct experience, that the standards of the Charter make themselves felt in the great mass of decisions which are made daily in the Foreign Offices of the world's governments. "How does this fit the Charter?" "How will this look in the United Nations?" These are constantly recurring questions where decisions are being made on difficult matters of policy. We suspect that in those chanceries where decisions are taken which are clearly contrary to the Charter that the question arises, "How can this be made to look in the United Nations?"

Insofar as the United States is concerned, the standards of the Charter are effective and are enforced. We are committed to them as basic elements of our policy. They are enforced by our people, through close inspection of our conduct, vigorous debate, and a persuasive expression of opinion both through normal political machinery and through the great national nongovernmental organizations. I can assure you, for example, that a clear condemnation by the Commonwealth Club of an act of ours in the field of foreign affairs would be taken as a very serious matter in the Department of State.

Thus far, the members of the United Nations have established a good record of compliance with the Charter. Unfortunately, the record is not good enough to give us confidence that we shall have peace. A powerful minority, the Soviet Union and a small collection of satellites, has refused to accept the minimum standards required by the Charter. I had occasion to say in Boston last week, "If we are concerned about the Soviet Union, it is not because they wish to organize themselves along Communist lines—if they wish to waste their energies and resources that is their business. But we are concerned because the Soviet Union is pursuing a course of Russian imperialism incompatible with the minimum conduct required by the international community of nations."

Settling of Disputes

To turn to a second point, the United Nations is successfully settling disputes—disputes which have in them the seeds of war. Members have committed themselves to settle their disputes by peaceful means. The Security Council and the General Assembly are available to help if help is required. In the field of settling disputes, the United Nations has operated with great success, with flexibility, imagination, and persistence which have not yet been fully recognized.

In the cases involving Iran, Syria and Lebanon, and Berlin, it was possible to reach something like a definitive settlement. In these three cases, it is interesting to note, one or more of the Big Five were involved. Other cases, such as Greece, Palestine, Kashmir, Indonesia, and Korea are still in the process of settlement.

GREECE

In Greece, the outlook for Greek independence is better than at any time since the war. Guerrillas in Greece itself have been reduced to an insignificant number. Incursions of guerrillas out of Albania have been driven back by vigorous action on the part of the Greek Army. Just this week, guerrilla forces announced that they have given up the fight. The border between Greece and Yugoslavia is rapidly being restored to normal conditions. If the Greek case can be successfully disposed of, many factors will have contributed. The reviving determination and morale of the Greeks themselves, the watchdog activities of the United Nations Balkan commissions, the spotlight of world public opinion focused on the situation by the Security Council and the General Assembly, the program of direct assistance to Greece by the United States, and the inability of the Kremlin to maintain its authority along the northern Greek frontier are all factors. An effort is now being made by the General Assembly to bring a final conclusion to this case. If Greece's northern neighbors are ready to put their borders with Greece on a normal basis and to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of Greece, a settlement is possible. A settlement is not possible at the expense of Greek freedom, under any formula which merely permits those forces who have failed to destroy Greece to reenter in another guise to take up their aggression all over again. If a settlement comes, as I believe it will, the Greek case will have provided another instance of effective United Nations action in the interest of peace and the independence of its members.

PALESTINE

In Palestine, the United Nations has been confronted with a problem of almost inconceivable

complexity and difficulty. The emotions of the peoples concerned were deeply engaged. The demands of the parties were mutually exclusive, with little chance for compromise. The historical, moral, and legal issues were confused and inconclusive. The full story will be told when the historian can have a cool and steady look at the record. But I believe that the story will show that the United Nations throughout its effort sought with great persistence to find a solution by peaceful means of a sort which would permit Jew and Arab to live at peace with each other in the Holy Land. War broke out, and it was ended. Palestine is now living under an armistice; there is no reason to suppose that fighting will be resumed. It may be a long time before governments can bring their peoples to accept a formal settlement but little by little the processes of normal life will return. Meanwhile, the United Nations remains a channel of communication and an effective means whereby the parties can approach each other and at the same time present their views to world judgment. The immediate tasks are to find a practical way to take care of the hundreds of thousands of homeless and to resolve the peculiar complexities of the Holy City of Jerusalem. There are no easy answers, but we can expect the United Nations to assist the parties in solving the hard ones; in any event, I believe the final answer will mean peace—and will commend itself to fair and impartial opinion. There are many Arabs and Jews alive today because of the United Nations and because of the unarmed, unknown, and unsung men who labored patiently and courageously to make peace possible in Palestine.

KASHMIR

In Kashmir, the United Nations was confronted by a problem arising from the partition of India into the independent states of India and Pakistan, a part of the unfinished business of that great political event. The basic issue is the disposition of Kashmir. The main question, however, is interwoven with a complex of religious feeling, national prestige, legal subtleties, and economic pressures. The matter has been before the United Nations for almost 2 years. Underlying the need for a settlement is the tragic prospect of a renewal of Moslem-Hindu strife which took the lives of hundreds of thousands in 1947 at the time of the partition. Although an effective cease-fire is now in effect, the shape of a political settlement is still to come. The United Nations Commission has not been able to bring about an agreement by mediation, although both sides have accepted the important idea that the people of Kashmir by a plebiscite should have the right to determine their own political future. But the details of procedure have not been agreed upon; Pakistan has accepted arbitration of truce issues as a means of moving the

dispute toward a settlement; India has, however, refused. In just what way the United Nations will continue its effort to find a way out, it is not possible to say. That it must and will continue to try, goes without saying. The art of peacemaking is the laborious art of picking up the pieces and starting all over again, despite set-back and discouragement. We can hope that the high fevers have been talked out of the Kashmir dispute by almost endless United Nations debate, and I believe that a solution will be found which will not include war between India and Pakistan.

INDONESIA

In Indonesia, we were confronted by a situation which threatened the peace of southeast Asia, which could have stirred deep racial antipathies between East and West and which pitted the explosive force of rising nationalism against prewar colonial systems. The question raised in the Security Council some exceedingly troublesome questions of Charter interpretation, questions which had to be set aside in order to get at the settlement which was required to maintain the peace. Although the story of the Indonesian case is long and complicated, there is a fair prospect for a satisfactory ending. At a round-table conference now in session at The Hague, we hope that there shall be evolved a fundamental agreement which will satisfy the nationalist aspirations of the Indonesians and retain a cooperative arrangement between Dutch and Indonesians without which a young United States of Indonesia would have very rough sailing. For the new Indonesian Government will have to organize the political and economic life of the country and its moderate leaders must be prepared to demonstrate at once their ability to withstand the assaults of extremists of many varieties including Communists. To accomplish this tremendous task, the new government will need the sympathetic encouragement and assistance of the Netherlands. There is good reason to believe that moderate Dutch and moderate Indonesian leadership can work out an agreement of historic importance—if it can be done soon.

KOREA

In Korea, unfortunately, the prospect for a unified, independent Korea is not encouraging. The case went to the General Assembly because the United States concluded that Korean unity and independence, promised to them by the Allies during the war, should not be frustrated indefinitely by the failure of ourselves and the Soviet Union to agree. The General Assembly established procedures under which the country would be united and a constitution and government erected which

would represent the freely expressed wishes of the Koreans themselves. The Soviet Union boycotted the United Nations Korean Commission and refused to admit it into north Korea. Korea is now split, with the southern and larger portion under a government established by the procedure provided by the United Nations and with the northern portion cut off from the non-Communist world by its Communist rulers. The Government of the Republic of Korea, that is the government in southern Korea, is acknowledged as the only legitimate government in Korea by the great majority of the governments of the world. The eventual outcome of this unfortunate situation cannot be predicted, but it is the most direct example we now have of the inability of the United Nations to bring about a settlement, where the Soviet Union is in position to enforce a "veto" on the ground.

These are not the only disputes which have come before the United Nations but these suffice to set the pattern and to permit a judgment. On the positive side, we can report that the United Nations has come upon fighting and has brought it to an end. The restraining hand of the world community is maintaining peace, even though a troubled peace, in places where the alternative would be war. The United Nations has encountered the most powerful emotions of the human race and has brought them under a degree of control. It has applied the poultice of endless negotiation and debate where time and discussion seemed able to reduce the heat of controversy. It has shown great flexibility in the instruments selected for particular disputes—committees and commissions, mediators and conciliators, Security Council and General Assembly, negotiation by formal or informal means, through public or private talks—changing from one to the other where a change of pace or of forum seemed desirable. The United Nations has been able to put aside national prestige where prestige might have prevented a settlement, for no nation has been able to assert a right to make war contrary to the Charter or turn aside from the processes of peaceful settlement because of considerations of national prestige. In no case which has thus far come to the United Nations has the fighting spread beyond the limits of the specific dispute—despite the presence of important great-power interests in the areas affected. Men have been developed in the work of the United Nations, both at Lake Success and in the field, who have become expert in the settlement of disputes—a reservoir of skill and good sense on which we can draw as other disputes arise to plague the peace of the world.

Mobilizing Public Opinion

Finally, the United Nations has mobilized world public opinion behind the Charter and in the interest of peace. When the history of this period is

written, I believe it will show that organized public opinion has been much more powerful than we are now inclined to believe. If there is a struggle for power, in the first instance it is a struggle for power over men's minds. If conduct contrary to the Charter can be quickly confronted by the firm and unmistakable opposition of the rest of the world, the cost of such a policy becomes very great.

Fields in Which Agreement Has Not Been Reached

If the United Nations has done a great deal to maintain the peace, and I believe the record will show conclusively that it has, the anxieties of our current scene suggest that there must be a number of things which the United Nations has not been able to do.

LACK OF SOVIET COOPERATION

Specifically, the United Nations has not been able to obtain compliance by the Soviet Union with its obligations under the Charter nor the cooperation of the Soviet Union in carrying out the purposes and principles upon which the organization was founded. To the extent that the loyal participation of the Soviet Union is not required, the United Nations, by and large, is getting on with its job. To the extent that the help and assistance of the Soviet Union is essential, the United Nations is frustrated, faltering and disappointing. It is a serious charge, but it is based on sober fact.

VETO

The impact of Soviet policy is felt not merely in its abuse of the veto in the Security Council—an abuse which is threatening to sap the prestige of that vital body. The more important veto is on the ground, in places like Greece and Korea, where settlement has been frustrated by a refusal to use the elementary processes of peace. Commissions established by the Security Council and by the General Assembly have been boycotted. Of the eleven specialized agencies, organized to carry out essential technical and economic work for the United Nations, the Soviet Union belongs only to two—the International Telecommunication Union and the Universal Postal Union, both of which predated the United Nations. Where the United Nations has sought to carry out a major humanitarian effort as in the International Refugee Organization, the program for Palestine Refugee Relief, or the International Children's Emergency Fund, the contribution from Moscow has been zero.

ATOMIC ENERGY

In another field, the problem is even more acute.

The production of an atomic explosion by the Soviet Union underlines in red the fact that we have made no appreciable progress toward an effective system of international control of atomic energy. From the moment of the first public knowledge of the existence of an atomic bomb, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada have sought to bring about a system of effective international control in order that mankind would not be confronted by the spectre of an atomic armaments race. Other nations joined in the same effort in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission and, eventually in the General Assembly itself. The majority plan which resulted from this serious and devoted effort is, we think, the framework for an effective international control, the only one which has thus far been developed. We have repeatedly declared that we are prepared to study closely any proposals from any source which offer equally effective or more effective control than is provided by the majority plan. This is a matter on which we dare not deceive ourselves. If the Soviet political system is such that it cannot stand the strain of the knowledge and controls implicit in an effective plan of control, it is cold comfort to think that we understand why we have competitive atomic weapons. Without effective international control, we are back to our fundamental, we must prevent war.

Performance From Soviets Needed

These are among the reasons why we have stated that the main issue of our day is peace—and that on this issue the Soviet Union confronts not the United States alone but the rest of the world. The rest of us have very little to ask of the Soviet Union—no new sacrifice, no expenditure of resources or lives or prestige. We want it to settle its international disputes by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of its force against the territorial integrity and political independence of other states. Nothing more. These are already the solemn pledge of the Soviet State—we need performance. If this promise, made at the close of an awful war, is now treated with contempt, how much shall we pay for more promises—or how content can we be with our security?

Under the circumstances, would it be better for us all if the Soviet Union should leave the United Nations? The question arises in moments of exasperation and irritation and occasionally flits like a ghost along the corridors of Lake Success. As we see it, the answer is simple—we should deeply regret the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from the United Nations. What we really want them to do is not to withdraw but to join. It is important that Premier Stalin is pledged to the Charter along with the other leading statesmen of the world and that their integrity is involved in compliance with its obligations. It is important that Soviet delegations join

with the rest of us to answer for our national conduct before the Security Council, the General Assembly and the other organs of the United Nations. We believe that the basic self-interests of the governments and peoples of the world lie in the conduct required by the Charter. We do not despair, therefore, that this basic self-interest can eventually assert itself and compel the Soviet Union to work with the rest of us on a basis compatible with peace. If there is possibility for agreement on specific matters, the machinery of the United Nations makes it easy to ascertain where such possibility lies and to work out an accommodation without painful costs in pride or prestige. In any event, if the Soviet Union is an active participant in the annual debates of the General Assembly, there will be less opportunity for it to make a tragic miscalculation about the attitudes of others and less temptation to hazard adventure through a misunderstanding of what the rest of the world would abide.

Is the U.N. Assuring American Security?

It has taken a considerable time to come back to my subject. Is the United Nations paying its way in terms of American security? I am convinced that it is. We are confronted by the major hurdle of Soviet policy. Let us assume that we shall eventually get over that hurdle, that even though we pass through a period of discomfort and tension, we manage somehow to work out a tolerable basis on which the Soviets can live in the world with all the rest of us. If we can be even thus modestly optimistic about the future, then we have every possible reason for supporting the work of the United Nations in the security field. Its ultimate purposes are our own; its standards are those we would set for ourselves. It provides machinery for as much effort as we and other members are willing to make at any one time toward the accomplishment of our common aims. The formal machinery is being powerfully reinforced by strong personal friendships among the leaders of the world, regularly renewed at the table of the United Nations. Disputes are being settled, fighting is being stopped, troubles are being localized. The weight of the world organization is being successfully thrown behind the concept of law and peaceful settlement. Since I believe we mean to comply with our own obligations, I believe we shall have nothing to fear from the judgments of the United Nations. And since I believe that there is no prospect of peace for ourselves unless there be a general system for maintaining peace throughout the world, we shall gain much from the success of the United Nations.

But you may prefer to take a more gloomy view

and may wish to assume that we shall not see a change in Soviet policy for a long time to come. If that is your view, you are compelled to give the United Nations even more of your support. For if we are to prevent a major war, it must be through the clearly demonstrated determination of the world community to resist aggression with all the means at its disposal. This essential solidarity in defense of the Charter is not a matter of passing a resolution or signing a treaty. It will come gradually, through countless acts of cooperation among men of good will and common sentiment. If danger comes, it will be most effectively met not on the basis of reluctant decisions made under the shadow of tragic events but on the basis of a common cause and an inescapable decision made in the long process of building a peace.

Our anxieties shall be with us for some time to come. We shall solve some of our problems and shall undoubtedly accumulate others. The Secretary of State recently told the General Assembly that those we cannot solve, we must endure. But I am convinced that we are developing an instrument in the United Nations which can remove the technical impediments to the maintenance of peace and a forum in which the issue of peace will not turn on tragic accident. More we cannot expect from the United Nations. There is no formula by which we can surely know whether man is wise enough to survive. But we shall try, with faith and hope and persistence, and we shall find that we are of a goodly company of men from all parts of the earth.

Conciliation Committee Suspends Activities

Letter From the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of Committee I

U.N. doc. A/C. 1/503
Dated Oct. 18, 1949

The Conciliation Committee created by the First Committee at its 276th meeting on 29 September 1949 to reach a pacific settlement of existing differences between Greece on one hand, and Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia on the other, after holding twenty-nine meetings has authorized me to report with regret that in spite of its best efforts it was unable to develop a basis of conciliation on which an agreement could be reached between the Governments of Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Greece.

However, the Committee believes that the discussions served a useful purpose in clarifying and in some cases narrowing the points of difference

between the Governments concerned and can serve as a starting point in case conditions in the future should warrant the resumption of the Committee's work. I need hardly add that the Committee would be happy to resume its efforts at any time during the present session whenever the parties concerned consider this to be desirable.

In the meantime, the Conciliation Committee has no alternative but to suspend its activities in order that the First Committee may resume its discussion of the question of the threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece. That discussion was postponed pending the work of the Conciliation Committee. The reason for that postponement now unfortunately no longer exists.

I regret that I have to make a report of this negative character. I am confident that the members of the First Committee will accept my assurance that the Conciliation Committee did everything in its power to facilitate agreement between the parties concerned. Whether by this means or by direct negotiations between the interested Governments, it is essential to reach such an agreement if conditions of security and stability are to be restored in the areas concerned.

Greek Guerrillas Cease Activities

Statement by Secretary Acheson

[Released to the press October 17]

As a result of the Greek Army offensives in October in the Grammos-Vitsi areas, Greek Government forces now for the first time since the war command the northern borders of Greece. Guerrilla forces operating within Greece amount to approximately two thousand, scattered in small groups over the entire country. In most cases, these groups are mainly concerned with self-protection and raiding for food and are continually being pursued and harassed. There has been a noticeable trend of the leaders and some of the members of these groups to work their way toward Albania.

Most of the guerrillas who fled from Greece as the result of the Grammos-Vitsi campaigns entered Albania. There are approximately eight thousand five hundred guerrillas located in Albania. There is estimated to be about three thousand guerrillas in Bulgaria. Some of these guerrillas in Bulgaria entered the country as the result of recent operations in northeastern Greece, but the majority of them have been in Bulgaria over a period of time as a part of guerrilla operations and hospitalization which has taken place in

Bulgaria. There is no objective information available to the Department giving evidence that the guerrillas in either Albania or Bulgaria have been disarmed or interned.

According to the United Nations Special Committee, the Yugoslav Government has closed the Greek borders, precluding the entry of fleeing guerrillas, and has not recently lent support to these forces. In general, the closed border appears to have been effective, except in a few cases in which some guerrilla forces have entered Yugoslavia where the terrain is very rugged and sparsely manned by the Yugoslavs. It is not believed that there is a large number of guerrillas now remaining in Yugoslavia.

Unconfirmed reports have indicated that guerrillas located in Albania are being moved by sea or air from Albania to Bulgaria, Rumania, and possibly other satellite countries. The Department is in possession of no information indicating the purpose of this reported redistribution.

The "cease fire" guerrilla announcement is, in any case, a practical recognition of the state of affairs existing at this time. The stated purpose of the announcement, in order to "save Greece from destruction," must be viewed with some scepticism in as much as during guerrilla operations in force in Greece, they engaged to the fullest extent possible in the destruction of the Greek economy and resorted to every crime against humanity, including murder, arson, kidnapping, wholesale slaughter, abrogation of all liberties, and terrorizing whole areas. Now that these guerrillas who are located in Greece are forced to devote their activities to self-preservation and the majority of the guerrilla forces, because they are located outside of Greece, can no longer indulge in bringing about ruin and disaster, it is natural that they would attempt to make political salvage by attributing their defeat to the tardily announced desire "to save Greece from destruction."

Repatriation of Greek Children

Secretary-General Trygve Lie announced that the international Red Cross organizations submitted a complete report on their negotiations with the authorities in various countries concerning the repatriation of Greek children with a view to promoting the early return to their homes.¹

In his note he stated that in the course of 1949, he had been "in communication with the International Committee of the Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies as well as the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia."

¹ U.N. doc. A/1014.

Debate on Violation of Human Rights in Eastern Europe Continued

*Statement by Benjamin V. Cohen,
U. S. Alternate Representative to the General Assembly*¹

I am sorry that the Soviet Union representative has suggested that we have abused and done violence to the treaty procedures in attempting to invoke them to deal with the complaint we have made. I should have thought that Sir Hartley Shawcross had so adequately disposed of that point this morning that it would be unnecessary for me to say more. But I fear, from listening to Mr. Vyshinsky's speech, that he did not hear or understand what Sir Hartley has said.

Mr. Vyshinsky constantly refers to the first clause of the final clauses in the satellite treaties—that is article 37 in the Rumanian treaty. That provides, for the first 18 months after the coming into effect of the treaty, that the heads of the three diplomatic missions—the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States—acting in concert, will represent the Allied and associated Powers in dealing with the ex-enemy governments in all matters concerning the execution and interpretation of the present treaty.

Unfortunately, however, Mr. Vyshinsky ignores, as far as he possibly can do, the second clause of the final clauses of these treaties, which is the clause that we are relying upon. It is article 38 of the Rumanian treaty. I will read it, because I do not know how it could be worded more plainly or more clearly. It says:

Except where another procedure is specifically provided under any Article of the present Treaty, any dispute—I repeat—any dispute concerning the interpretation or execution of the Treaty, which is not settled by direct diplomatic negotiations, shall be referred to the Three Heads of Mission acting under Article 37, except that in this case the Heads of Mission will not be restricted by the time limit provided in that Article.

Now I would like to ask whether that clause that I have read to you can have any meaning if there can be no dispute that is not commonly presented by the three powers, because what purpose would

there be in providing that the dispute should be referred to the three heads of mission, if the three principal powers had to agree in advance that there was a dispute.

But that is not all. Read on in this clause and it says: "Any such dispute not resolved by them . . ." If they had agreed in advance to present the dispute, there could be no possibility, it seems to me, that the dispute would not be resolved by them. But this clause reads, as I have said:

. . . Any such dispute not resolved by them within a period of two months shall, unless the parties to the dispute mutually agree upon another means of settlement, be referred at the request of either party to the dispute to a Commission composed of one representative of each party and a third member selected by mutual agreement of the two parties from nationals of a third country. . . .

I submit that no one can read that article without clearly understanding that it covers any dispute between any signatory of the treaty and the ex-enemy states, party to the treaty.

Insofar as Mr. Vyshinsky raises a point that a dispute as to whether there is a dispute is not a dispute, I submit that that is a philosophy and an argument that does not belong in the realm of affairs of practical men.

I am sorry Mr. Vyshinsky is not here while I am speaking because I would like to recall to him what he and I so well remember, that the treaty procedures were devised by the Council of Foreign Ministers and by the Paris peace conference to provide means of breaking a deadlock when disputes arose. The Soviet delegation, at the Council of Foreign Ministers and at the peace conference, had desired to leave the settlement of disputes to the heads of missions, that is to the great powers. That is just as Mr. Vyshinsky would like to have it believed the treaties read.

But we never consented to having the treaties read in this way, and the provisions for the setting-up of a disputes commission with an independent third member, capable of making a decision when

¹ Made in the *ad hoc* Political Committee on Oct. 12, 1949, and released to the press by the U.S. delegation to the United Nations on the same date. For Mr. Cohen's statement of October 4, see BULLETIN of Oct. 24, 1949, p. 617.

the head of a mission or the parties to the dispute could not agree, was finally accepted and written into the peace treaties.

The protracted discussions which took place before the Soviet delegation accepted the clauses in the treaties makes it extremely difficult for Mr. Vyshinsky now to urge that the Soviet delegation was not completely aware of their purpose and meaning. The speakers opposing our proposal have argued that in their judgment the charges of treaty violations that the United States and other parties to the treaties have made against Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, are without foundation. They have further argued that the treaty procedures do not cover charges of the character we have made. Their arguments do not and cannot alter the fact that we have made these charges, and we have asserted that in our judgment the treaty procedures are applicable to them.

As we are all committed to the peaceful adjustment of disputes it would seem obviously correct and proper for the Assembly to seek the legal service of the International Court of Justice as to whether the treaty procedures do apply to such disputes as are involved in the charges we have presented. We ourselves have no doubt that the treaty procedures do apply, but we have indicated our willingness to be bound by the advisory opinion of the court.

If the representative of the Soviet Union, and other representatives, who share his views are so certain of their position it is indeed difficult to understand why they should oppose, rather than welcome, an impartial and definite decision.

The Soviet representative has particularly objected to question IV which we propose to submit to the Court. He says an affirmative answer to this question would be clearly contrary to the treaties. If he so believes, and I am afraid that this argument applies also to the representative of France, why are they unwilling to have an opinion from the Court on this subject? Mr. Vyshinsky says the question indicates an intent to bring about arbitration with one of the parties excluded, but the representative of the Soviet Union overlooked in his argument an important part of the question to be put to the Court.

The question is expressly predicated on the failure of one party to appoint a representative to the Disputes Commission. There is no suggestion that a party to the dispute should be denied the right to be represented on the Disputes Commission. The question is whether the Commission can proceed if one of the states party to the dispute refuses to appoint its representative? Can it be that a party to a treaty can frustrate its execution by his own default? That, I submit, is a proper question for us to put to the Court.

The claims put forward by the Soviet Union regarding these treaties, however, raise other and

even more serious issues. It is a grave cause for concern to us, and we think to the Assembly, that at the same time that the Soviet Union is unwilling to employ existing treaty procedures, it should be suggesting further treaties, and further so-called peace pacts. It is not my purpose to anticipate, in this Committee, a debate on the Soviet proposals for a peace pact among the great powers but it is pertinent here to inquire what purpose any treaty can serve if it is to remain the sovereign right of any party to refuse to recognize the treaty at its own judgment and discretion.

We believe that treaties when made should be carried out. We believe in treaties as instruments of law. We do not believe in treaties as instruments of propaganda. We are opposed to the facade theory of treaties under which states render lip service to important principles and then, instead of accepting safeguards for their observance, find easy means of escape and evasion.

Under the Charter, the peoples of the United Nations express their determination to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained. We stand by the Charter and the law of the Charter which we have all undertaken to protect and defend.

The serious charges, which we have brought under the peace treaties and are prepared to establish under the impartial procedures provided by those treaties, cannot be disposed of, in our view, by mere assertion that Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania are only doing what is being done by other states.

We have already indicated that we do not challenge the right of any country to punish genuine attempts to overthrow the government by force, or to see that proper judicial procedures and safeguards are observed. Of course, other states prosecute treason and similar acts done with intent to overthrow the lawfully established government by force. Their task, it is true, in protecting their democratic institutions has been enormously complicated by the efforts of the Soviet Union to use the world Communist movement as an instrument to promote and carry out in other countries by stealth, intimidation, and force, whatever policies are laid down by the Soviet Union.

The use by the Soviet Union of the world Communist movement as an instrument of Soviet foreign policy has complicated the problem not only of non-Communist countries but even of Communist countries which do not completely subordinate their own policy and their own interests to those of the Soviet Union.

But we are not now dealing with the situation in the Soviet Union, or in the United States, or in the United Kingdom, or in Yugoslavia, or in Greece. We are dealing with the situation in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. To these countries we have assumed by reason of our wartime pledge special responsibilities to their people.

If we only could, in fulfillment of our joint responsibilities to these people, agree upon minimum common standards of human rights, we might indeed have a foundation on which we could build enduring peace throughout the rest of the world.

We regret the unwarranted accusations which the Soviet representative has made concerning the motives of the United States in raising this question of violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. Our concern has been, and will continue to be, to do what is possible to see that pledges which have been given—that the peoples of these countries should have governments of their own free choice and should enjoy human rights—are not violated or ignored. In supporting freedom of elections, freedom of press and publication, and freedom of religious worship, the United States is not attempting to impose any particular political group or any particular institutions on the peoples of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, as the Soviet representative has alleged. On the contrary, it is the Soviet Union working through a minority ruling group which has imposed its own imperialist aims on these peoples. In these circumstances it ill behooves the Soviet Government to characterize the invocation of the peace treaties by other signatory states as intervention in the domestic affairs of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, or to confuse the basic issues of human rights by labeling as traitors, Fascists, reactionaries, saboteurs, and common criminals all persons who do not accept the fiat of the Communist high command. It was certainly never thought at the time the treaties were drafted that the provisions concerning the dissolution of Fascist organizations meant that everyone friendly to the United States was to be regarded as a Fascist.

Our complaint is not of the miscarriage of justice in isolated cases. Our complaint is against a pattern of conduct disclosing a clear design to suppress not only expressions of independent opinion but all sources of independent opinion. The cases of Petkov, Maniu, Cardinal Mindszenty, and the Protestant pastors are only the high points in a long series of incidents and events evidencing an intent upon the part of these governments to deny to their peoples their elementary human rights. These incidents and events disclose, in our view, an intent on the part of these governments under the guise of suppressing treason and subversion to usurp by force and intimidation authority in the name but contrary to the wishes of their peoples.

As I have said, governments to have a moral base must rest in some way on the free and continuing consent of the governed. Some of the representatives here, particularly the representative of Poland, have shown great interest in conditions in the

United States. I freely admit that in the field of human rights no nation is completely without sin or shortcomings. But in the United States we are not turning back the clock of human freedom, we are making substantial progress.

I need only refer to the opinions of our Supreme Court which have given in recent years increased vitality to our Bill of Rights. It would not be appropriate for me to comment upon the New York Communist trials which are now *sub judice*, but I believe it would be proper for me to observe that all parties to the trials recognize that the proceedings are to be governed by the high standards set in the recent opinions of the United States Supreme Court.

The comments, fair and unfair, which some of the representatives have made on conditions in the United States are taken largely from the American press and from American publications. The writers quoted have not been gaoled or liquidated for writing what they think. Nor is peaceful political opposition stifled or intimidated in the United States. Mr. Dewey and Mr. Wallace are free to continue their attacks on the Administration's policies as their consciences dictate. Any thought of suppressing or liquidating them would be regarded not only as reprehensible but ridiculous by the Administration's supporters as well as their critics.

We resolve our differences and choose our political leaders in free electoral contests. But what is of even greater importance, the struggle to advance and safeguard the human rights of our people is led not by underground leaders in fear of their lives but by people active in the economic and political life of our country, many of our business leaders and—last but not least—the President of the United States himself. It was indeed President Truman who established a nonpartisan Civil Rights Commission to consider ways and means of safeguarding more adequately the civil rights of all our people, without regard to race or religion. Many people active in public life—including the President—are urging the acceptance of the Commission's recommendations. There may be, and there are, serious differences among us regarding these and other policies, but the freedom of the people to discuss them is unimpaired. With us, government does rest on the free and continuing consent of the governed.

Our people need no iron discipline. If we want a peaceful world where men and nations devoted to different ways of life can live in freedom, let us strive for common understanding as a rudimentary human right that every individual should enjoy, no matter what system of government he may live under. Let us give effect to the determination expressed in the Charter by the peoples of the United Nations to reaffirm their faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of the individual. To that end let us respect our treaty and our Charter obligations.

The United States in the United Nations

[October 22-28]

Cornerstone Laid for New United Nations Headquarters

On October 24, the fourth anniversary of the coming into force of the United Nations Charter, Secretary-General Trygve Lie laid the cornerstone of the new permanent headquarters of the United Nations. Ten thousand people took part in the celebration for which a special plenary meeting of the General Assembly was convened on the Manhattan headquarters site. President Truman, who gave the major address, declared that the Charter embodies the hopes and ideals of men everywhere.

General Assembly Plenary Action

Elections.—On October 20, the General Assembly elected Yugoslavia, Ecuador, and India to the Security Council. After Yugoslavia defeated Soviet-sponsored Czechoslovakia, Soviet Representative Andrei Vyshinsky denounced the result as a violation of the Charter. In remarks, ruled out of order by Assembly President Romulo, Mr. Vyshinsky declared that the Assembly should be bound by a so-called "gentlemen's agreement" and hence should elect Czechoslovakia a candidate. He declared that Yugoslavia "was not, cannot, and will not" be considered as a representative of the Eastern European Countries.

After the Security Council elections, the Ukraine withdrew its candidacy from the Economic and Social Council in favor of Czechoslovakia. Mexico, Iran, the United States, Pakistan, Canada, and Czechoslovakia were chosen on the first ballot to fill the six Economic and Social Council positions. Argentina and Iraq were elected to 3-year terms on the Trusteeship Council and the Dominican Republic was elected to a vacancy on the Trusteeship Council.

Freedom of Information.—The General Assembly on October 20 and 21 approved resolutions dealing with freedom of information: One postponed further action on the draft convention on freedom of information to the fifth session of the General Assembly; the other was recommended that the Economic and Social Council ask the Human Rights Commission to include adequate freedom of information provisions in the draft covenant on human rights. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the United States delegate, expressed confidence that the Human Rights Commission could formulate the necessary freedom-of-informa-

tion principles. She regretted the action of the Social Committee in not opening for signature at the current session the already completed news-gathering convention.

Finance.—The General Assembly took favorable action on six reports from the Finance Committee, including the financial report of the United Nations for the year ended December 31, 1948, financial report of the International Children's Emergency Fund, organization of United Nations Postal Administration, and scale of assessments.

Korea.—On October 21, the General Assembly approved the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's report and resolution on Korea. This resolution, opposed by the Slav states (including Yugoslavia) continues the United Nations Commission on Korea and directs it to observe and report any developments which might lead to or otherwise involve military conflict in Korea. A Soviet proposal to abolish the Commission was defeated. United States Alternate Representative Charles Fahy, speaking before the plenary on behalf of the resolution, said that the resolution was "an expression of the purpose of the General Assembly to promote the independence of a long-suffering and valiant people whom we should aid to achieve what so many of us enjoy—freedom and independence."

Human Rights.—The General Assembly on October 22, with only the Soviet bloc in opposition, decided to refer to the International Court of Justice legal questions relating to settlement by peace treaty procedures of differences arising from human rights violations in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. United States Representative Benjamin V. Cohen spoke on behalf of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's recommendation. His concluding remarks were: "Freedom can be shared by all men and all nations. Freedom can unite us—tyranny inevitably will divide us. Whatever modest progress we can make in dealing with the question before us will be a progress toward the basic goal of the United Nations—peace with justice and freedom for all."

Committee Action

Political Committee—Greece.—On October 18, the Committee heard a report from General Assembly President Romulo who stated that the Greek Conciliation Committee had met 29 times without being able to develop a basis of conciliation among the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, and Greece. During the following week, there was lengthy discussion on a resolution put forward by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics demanding that the

Greek Government repeal the "sentences of eight heroic fighters against the Hitlerite invaders," originally condemned to death by an Athens military court. In the course of the discussion, United States Representative Benjamin V. Cohen said, "We are all concerned about military executions in the world today." Mr. Cohen pointed out, however, that the United Nations was not in a position to deal with individual cases at this time, and he urged that the Committee concentrate on matters which give rise to conditions of instability—in this case, the threats to the security of Greece.

Sub-Committee 17.—The subcommittee approved on October 20 a draft resolution that Libya be established as a single, independent, and sovereign state and that independence be effective as soon as possible and in any case not later than January 1, 1952. The resolution provided for a constitution to be determined by consultation of representatives of the inhabitants of Cyrenaica, Tripolitania, and Fezzan, and for a United Nations commissioner appointed by the General Assembly and a Council to aid and assist him, the latter to consist of one representative each of Egypt, France, Italy, Pakistan, United Kingdom, and the United States, one representative of the peoples of each of the three regions, and one representative of the minorities.

The subcommittee also approved recommendations that Italian Somaliland should become an independent sovereign state 10 years from the effective date of an Italian trusteeship agreement (unless the General Assembly decided otherwise at the end of that period). The trusteeship agreement would be negotiated by Italy with the Trusteeship Council for submission to the Assembly, if possible, during the present session and in any case not later than the fifth regular session.

After exhaustive debate on the question of Eritrea, agreement was finally reached October 27 in the subcommittee to postpone the matter to allow study and investigation by a United Nations Commission to report to the Interim Committee by April 15, 1950, which in turn would make its recommendations to the fifth session of the General Assembly.

Ad Hoc Political Committee—Field Service.—The Committee opened consideration of the report of the Special Committee on United Nations Field Service and the two draft resolutions recommending the establishment of a 300-man field service and a panel of field observers. John Serman Cooper presented United States views as favoring both the field service and panel.

Economic Committee.—The Committee adopted on October 22 a revised Cuban resolution on the economic development of underdeveloped countries and opened general debate on the full employment item. Australia presented a resolution which stressed the importance of coordinated action to maintain full and productive employment "especially in countries which are responsible for

an important share of world trade," and recommended that all governments "consider as a matter of urgency" their Charter responsibility to take action, as the need arises, designed to promote full and productive employment. United States Alternate Representative, Wilson D. Compton, described the United States economic situation and supported the Australian resolution. A Czechoslovak speech alleged deterioration in the United States economic situation.

Social Committee.—The Social Committee unanimously approved a resolution establishing advisory social welfare services on a continuing basis and providing for their inclusion in the United Nations budget. The committee also took note of the Chapter dealing with the social, humanitarian, and cultural questions of the Economic and Social Council's report.

Trusteeship Committee.—The Committee discussed in detail administrative unions which permit the consolidation of certain functions affecting more than one trusteeship territory under a single administrative body. The debate centered on the question of whether such unions infringed upon the political rights of the inhabitants of trust territories. In general, administering powers defended administrative unions while nonadministering powers were generally suspicious of such arrangements. In the course of the discussion, the United States Representative Charles Fahy remarked that all trust territories should retain their original identity and that the Trusteeship Council should be able to exercise its powers of supervision. However, he pointed out, each union represented a separate case and hence the committee should not pronounce generalized judgments.

Administrative and Budgetary Committee.—The Committee completed action on several items, including the first reading of the 1950 budget and the headquarter item. It adopted a resolution taking note of the Secretary-General's report which summed up the status of construction activities.

Legal Committee.—The Committee discussed at length the draft declaration on the rights and duties of states, which comprises part II of the report of the International Law Commission. The United States proposal took note of the document and commended it as a "noble and substantial contribution toward codification of international law." Milan Bartos of Yugoslavia declared his government would like to have a convention based on the declaration of the rights and duties of states. He declared that the founding of the United Nations offered "the greatest and most justified hopes of the people, that it would lead to prevention of new wars of aggression, of wars which are, as we all know, the result of the attempt of certain states to impose their will upon other nations or states by means of interference, threat or use of force, or to aggrandize their territories at the expense of other peoples."

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Effective International Cooperation Through the Organization of American States

*Statement by President Truman*¹

Columbus Day provides a fitting opportunity for me to meet in a friendly and informal way with my distinguished neighbors, the Ambassadors on the Council of the Organization of American States. This organization is an outstanding example of effective international cooperation. The United States Government supports it wholeheartedly. The success of the inter-American system should encourage the peoples of other parts of the world to persevere in their efforts to solve common problems by mutual trust and helpfulness.

We have demonstrated how much can be accomplished when nations temper their national aspirations with concern for the interests of all. This is evident in the work of the American Republics for economic and social development. With increasing emphasis, we are striving to make possible a better life not only for people today but for generations still unborn. Our desire for security, in fact, is not primarily in order that our lives may remain unchanged, but that we may progressively realize our vast possibilities.

It is this spirit which motivates the growing exchange of technical knowledge and skill that has been taking place among our countries. We look forward to even more vigorous technical cooperation through all available channels, including the United Nations and its specialized agencies. We intend increasingly to help one another in the efforts of each to help himself.

We look to the Organization of American States for support of programs to raise living standards

¹ Made at a meeting of the Ambassadors to the Council of the Organization of American States on Oct. 12, 1949, and released to the press by the White House on the same date.

² BULLETIN of Sept. 26, 1949, p. 462; see also Department of State publication 3647.

and to foster balanced economic development throughout the hemisphere. And since material improvement would be sterile without cultural and intellectual growth, we should make every effort to intensify cultural and intellectual cooperation.

The organization has a great responsibility for strengthening the peace and security of the Americas and for inducing governments to respect their freely accepted international obligations. We in the inter-American system subscribe fully to the principle of nonintervention in the internal or external affairs of any American Republic. At the same time, we are definitely committed to the proposition that our solidarity and high aims are fostered by the exercise of representative democracy in the American states. I am confident that you will continue to provide inspiring leadership toward the achievement of these aims.

As for this government, Secretary Acheson stated recently before the Pan American Society in New York that the good-neighbor policy is for us a firmly established national policy.² I fully support the principles and objectives outlined by him on that occasion.

The United States is honored and happy to be the host country of the Organization of American States. We want you to feel most welcome and entirely at home among us as you continue your invaluable work in behalf of all the peoples of the American Republics.

Reply to the President by Ambassador Joseph D. Charles, Acting Chairman of the Council

MR. PRESIDENT: The members of the Council of the Organization of American States are deeply appreciative of your cordial invitation, which

gives us the opportunity to pay our respects to you on this Continental anniversary.

October 12th is celebrated in all our countries, because it marks the entry of the Western Hemisphere in the current of world history, where they are playing an increasingly important role. For the Organization of American States, it is a symbol of one of the fundamental bases on which our inter-American system rests, namely, the common factors in our historical background and the similarity of our political and social institutions. It is most appropriate, therefore, that we should observe this day not only as representatives of our respective Governments, but in our collective capacity as the Council of the Organization.

For it is through the Organization of American States, given its present form in 1948 as the latest step in the development of our inter-American system, that the American Republics are expressing their community of interest and their common devotion to the same ideals of international order and morality. In the last century and a quarter there has been evolving on the American Conti-

nent a pattern of international relations founded on the premise that the security and the welfare of each of our countries depends upon the security and the welfare of all, and that what affects one member of the community inevitably has its repercussions in all the others.

Such a system can be achieved only slowly, as the result of a conscious effort on the part of the several Governments, supported by their people. The growth of our system of inter-American relations, Mr. President, is due in no small part to the interest and support of your Government. The wise and enthusiastic cooperation of your representatives, at inter-American conferences, on the Council of the Organization of American States, and in the several specialized organizations, has contributed in large measure to the progress that has been achieved in the realization of the political, economic, social, and cultural objectives of the Organization of American States.

I am confident, Mr. President, that I voice the sentiment of each and every member of the Council when I say that on this auspicious occasion we renew our pledge to strive for the further realization of the high purposes for which our Organization stands.

Conclusions of the Inter-American Peace Committee With Reference to the Situation in the Caribbean ¹

The Inter-American Peace Committee, convoked at the initiative of the Representative of the United States to consider the situation that certain lamentable events have shown to exist in the political areas of the Caribbean, has given that delicate problem due attention and has studied carefully the various aspects of the situation with the valuable collaboration of those Governments that were good enough to send observations and suggestions.

The Committee believes that its duty in this matter is limited to the solemn reaffirmation of certain standards and principles, that are basic for American peace and solidarity, principles and standards whose proper observance would, in the opinion of the Committee, not only keep such a situation as the one under consideration from arising, but avoid even the slightest symptom of disturbed relations among the American States.

With the intention, then, of using to full advantage this occasion for once more calling to the attention of the American conscience the lofty and

indispensable postulates of our international relationships, the Committee believes it pertinent to formulate the following conclusions:

1. To reiterate the necessity that all the Member States of the American community continue to be guided in their international conduct by the principle of non-intervention, which is the basic principle of the Organization of American States and hence of Pan-Americanism, solemnly set forth in the "Additional Protocol Relative to Non-Intervention" signed at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace (Buenos Aires, 1936), and the latest and definitive expression of which is to be found in article 15 of the Bogotá Charter, in the following words:

No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements.

2. To recall, in connection with the foregoing, that the desire to avoid intervention in the internal

¹ Transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Mexican Ambassador on Sept. 15, 1949. See U.N. doc. S/1407, Oct. 13, 1949.

or external affairs of other States and, even more, the duty of each State to prevent its territory from being used for the preparation or initiation of aggression toward one or more States with which it is at peace, led the American States to sign the Convention on the Rights and Duties of States in the Event of Civil Strife, in 1928; and that, in line with these ideas, the Second Consultative Meeting of Foreign Ministers, in Resolution VII, recommended to the Governments of the American Republics some fundamental rules with respect to civil strife, applicable to the situation under study.

3. To express the fervent hope of the Committee that the aforementioned Convention on the Rights and Duties of States be ratified as promptly as possible by the American countries that have not yet done so; and also that it be clarified and perfected at some future inter-American meeting, if this should be considered necessary.

4. To consider the Resolution approved on December 24, 1948, by the Council of the Organization, acting provisionally as Organ of Consultation, with special emphasis on the paragraph in which the Council referred to the need (which might apply to any Government) of taking "adequate measures to rid its territory of groups of nationals or foreigners, organized on a military basis with the deliberate purpose of conspiring against the security of other sister republics, and of preparing to fight against their Governments."

5. To express, likewise, the desirability that the American nations make every effort, within the limits of their constitutional powers, to avoid any systematic and hostile propaganda, whatever its medium of expression, against other countries of the Continent or their respective Governments.

6. To consider the desirability of the maintenance, as far as possible and in consonance with Resolution XXXV of the Bogotá Conference, of continuity of close and cordial diplomatic relations among the American States, since, as the preamble of the said Resolution states, "the development of the activities and the full benefits of inter-American cooperation can be realized more effectively if continuous and friendly relations are maintained among the States."

7. To point out that a common denominator of American political life is the adherence, within the sovereignty of each State and in accordance with the characteristics of its own people, to the principles and the exercise of democracy, expressed formally in solemn American obligations (Declaration XXVII of the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, Buenos Aires, 1936; Recommendation LXXII of the Eighth International Conference of American States, Lima, 1938; Resolution VII of the Second Meeting of Consultation, Habana, 1940; Charter of Bogotá, 1948; Resolution XXXII of the Bogotá Confer-

ence), outstanding among which is the statement in paragraph (d) of article 5 of the Bogotá Charter, which reads as follows:

The solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy;

8. To make public its aspiration that the Charter of the Organization of American States, which, as provided for in Resolution I and XL of the Bogotá Conference, is the basic instrument of continental solidarity and is at present the means of determining the organization of the system and its component parts, receive definitive confirmation through ratification by all the Governments, so that the juridical and political structure of the Continent will be as complete and permanent as could be desired.

9. To repeat also its equally firm belief that at all times, and especially in the critical atmosphere that characterizes the present international situation, American solidarity should be strengthened even more, if possible, so as to overcome opportunity, through the unity of our peoples, any threat to world peace that might arise.

10. To state the Committee's belief that, to carry out the foregoing conclusion, it will be of great help if each American Government disseminates among all its inhabitants the fullest possible information as to the international obligations assumed by the American States, particularly in matters of non-intervention and of rights and duties of states in the event of civil strife.

11. To express its opinion that the effective application, by the American Governments, of the points to which the Bogotá Conference Resolution XXXII, on Preservation and Defense of Democracy in America, refers will result in establishing democratic institutions still more strongly in this hemisphere.

12. To offer once more the continuing willingness of the Inter-American Peace Committee to lend its services (within the limits of Resolution XIV of the Second Meeting of Consultation) for the pacific and friendly settlement of any conflict or difference that at any moment might arise between two or more American States.

13. To point out likewise, that, in addition to the services that the Inter-American Peace Committee is ever ready to offer, there are in the inter-American system, and concretely in the Organization, various means of recourse, the proper application of which is a guarantee of a reasonable settlement of any conflict that might arise between them: that is, the methods of pacific settlement that appear in the Pact of Bogotá and in other inter-American instruments, and also the Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, either in accordance with article 40 of the Charter or as Organ of Consultation in accordance with the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

14. To state that the foregoing conclusions do not apply exclusively, in the opinion of the Committee, to the situation referred to in the preamble of these conclusions, but to all the American Republics without exception.

The Committee has agreed, finally, to express to the American Governments that were good enough to transmit to it their helpful views as to the situation it has been studying, the appreciation of this group for their valuable and indispensable collaboration.

LUIS QUINTANILLA, *Chairman*
Ambassador, Representative of Mexico
 ENRIQUE V. COROMINAS
Ambassador, Representative of Argentina
 GONZALO GUELL
Ambassador, Representative of Cuba
 PAUL C. DANIELS
Ambassador, Representative of the United States
 HILDEBRANDO ACCIOLY
Ambassador, Representative of Brazil
 SANTIAGO ORTIZ
Secretary of the Committee

WASHINGTON, D. C.
 September 14, 1949

U.S. Delegations To International Conferences

Military Medicine and Pharmacy Congress

On October 17, the Department of State announced that Maj. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss, Surgeon General, United States Army, has been named chairman of the United States delegation to the Twelfth International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy. Under the auspices of the Mexican Government, this meeting is scheduled to be held at Mexico City, October 23-29, 1949. Named to serve as delegates were:

George E. Armstrong, Brig. Gen., Deputy Surgeon General, United States Army
 Harry G. Armstrong, Maj. Gen. Deputy Surgeon General, United States Air Force
 Joel Thompson Boone, Rear Admiral, General Inspector, Medical Department, United States Navy
 Wallace H. Graham, Brig. Gen., (MC) USAF, Personal Physician to the President
 Edward J. Kendricks, Brig. Gen., Chief, Staffing and Education Directorate, Office of the Surgeon General, United States Air Force
 Clifford A. Swanson, Rear Admiral, Surgeon General, United States Navy

October 31, 1949

Ralph C. Williams, M.D., Assistant Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service; Chief, Bureau of Medical Services, United States Public Health Service

The Congress will consider such topics as: (1) new medical and social problems encountered by the military services; (2) pathology and treatment of lesions caused by the atomic bomb; (3) war psychosis; and (4) care and evacuation of the sick and wounded.

The First Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy was sponsored by the Belgian Government in 1921 to bring together military medical services of participating states for the purpose of promoting the protection of human life in the armed forces. The Eleventh Congress of this series was held at Basel, Switzerland in June 1947.

ILO: Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees

On October 18, the Department of State announced that the following delegation will represent the United States at the first session of the International Labor Organization (ILO) Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers, scheduled to be held at Geneva, October 24-29:

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

Delegates

Robert J. Myers, Special Mission to France, Economic Cooperation Administration, Paris, France
 Edward B. Persons, chief, ILO Branch, Office of International Labor Affairs, United States Department of Labor

EMPLOYEES REPRESENTATIVES

Delegates

Richard P. Doherty, director, Employer-Employee Relations Division, National Association of Broadcasters, Washington, D.C.
 Frank L. Rowland, executive secretary, Life Office Management Association, New York, N.Y.

WORKERS REPRESENTATIVES

Delegates

Paul R. Hutchings, president, Office Employees International Union, Washington, D.C.
 Herman D. Kenin, member, International Executive Board, American Federation of Musicians, Portland, Oreg.

This session of the Advisory Committee will continue work started by the ILO prewar expert committees by preparing the way for the development of conventions regarding the rights of performers in the fields of radio, television, and mechanical reproduction of sound, and regarding rest periods in commercial establishments. The agenda for the first session includes also discussion of general working and living conditions of salaried and professional workers, the position of the salaried inventor, and manpower and training programs.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

Problems in American Foreign Policy

by Secretary Acheson¹

As I understand Al Smith's conception of the conduct of government—I am not speaking of that moral and spiritual compass from which he got his direction, but of the art of translating purpose into accomplishment—it was twofold.

First, any course of action must be deeply rooted in popular understanding and popular support—not merely in theory but in fact. And second, the administration for executing it must be made efficient by being simply designed so that responsibility and authority coincide and so that knowledge is mobilized and brought to the point of action. He then picked his men carefully and backed them to the limit.

These principles do not solve the problems of foreign affairs but they help tremendously those of use who work daily upon them.

What are those problems? Greatly oversimplified, but not untruly distorted, there are two sets of problems which react upon one another. And these are not peculiarly American problems. They exist, in more or less degree, in every country in what we call the free world.

One set of problems arises from the conduct in international affairs of the Soviet Union, as the aggressively imperialist power of our times, seeking to extend its dominion where its grasp and its reach coincide, and to cause confusion and disintegration where its grasp falls short.

The second is a set of problems which would exist if the Soviet Union did not.

Those are the problems, economic, social, political, which arise, as in Europe, from the disruptions of war and changed relationships with other parts of the world—as in Asia, from a great

awakening of peoples to a new revulsion against the acceptance of poverty and hunger and to a consciousness of national independence.

In the American Republics, in the Middle East, in Africa, there is the same demand for and movement toward the development necessary for a better life. Movement means the affirmation of the worth of new ends, the creation of new ideals, new challenges to Americans who, of all people, believe that life is not, and cannot be, static, and that material advance is not achieved by embracing the discarded tyrannies of the barbaric past.

Now, you see at once that these two sets of problems are interrelated. The thrust of Soviet imperialism in Eastern Europe or Asia affects not only those areas, but also their relations with other areas. And this in turn adds to the difficulty of those other areas in solving their problems, which are difficult enough, in all conscience, without extraneous impediments.

Similarly, the success or lack of success of parts of the free world in gaining a strength and stability affects the direction and vigor of Soviet thrusts. So few problems are isolated. Most are part of a very complicated mosaic.

But this is not the end of the matter. Nations are usually symbolized in our minds as individuals—Uncle Sam, John Bull, Marianne, et cetera. But they are not individuals. They are many individuals—millions of them. And in the free world, at least, they are held more or less loosely together by many institutions, of which government is only one—such as, churches, labor unions, business and farm organizations, political parties.

Within the nation are many stresses and strains. What a nation should do, if it were one person with one will and one mind, is often very different from what it actually can do, and does

¹ An address delivered before the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation in New York, N.Y. on Oct. 20, 1949, and released to the press on the same date.

do, when those in charge of its government resolve the multiplicity of thrusts into a single decision.

These, then, are in rough outline some of the problems which confront the worker in the field of our foreign relations. But even they are not all.

He must understand that the posture of his own country is one of the most potent factors affecting both its will and its power. And by its posture, I mean, for instance, whether it is economically vigorous or distracted by troubles; I mean the state of its defenses; I mean whether its people are looking inward upon a conflict of purposes, or outward with calm determination. All this must weight his judgment.

He must know also the limitations of the power of his own country and the limitations of his own position within it. In most cases a decision on policy and resultant action does not settle the matter under consideration. The action of others is more often than not the controlling factor. American assistance to other nations is always marginal assistance. The issue turns primarily upon their own will and effort. They may lead to hopeful results, as in European recovery, or to failure, as in China.

One of my colleagues remarked of Americans in foreign affairs, that there is a general belief that anyone may put a nickel in us and we must come up with a policy to solve any problem. To think this oversimplifies the problems and completely misunderstands our role in world affairs.

We can help greatly those who are doing their utmost to succeed by their own efforts. We cannot direct or control; we cannot make a world, as God did, out of chaos. There are some, apparently, who think that we should do this, and in less than 6 days!

So we must think of ourselves, to paraphrase words of Justice Holmes, not as little gods outside the community of nations, but as ganglions within it—as less than it, and as gaining our significance from the beneficence of our function and effect within it.

Similarly, one who works upon the foreign relations of the United States must understand his position within the country and the government. Vital as our foreign relations are to us, they are not the totality of our interests. There are thousands of other interests with which our interests abroad must be harmonized. So within our minds and within the government, the Department cannot think of itself as an institution apart, in monopolistic control of an isolated field of activity.

The Department is one of many staff arms of the President. It must work in harmony with, in understanding of, and often through these other arms. Its recommendations must fit into a total program which the American people are prepared to support.

This means, of course, that the Department is

not and cannot be an aloof organization. It must be close to the American people, constantly reporting the facts without which informed judgment or criticism cannot be made. It must not be afraid to tell the truth when that is painful and unpleasant, as it was in the China white paper. It must not be afraid to recommend and fight for courses which are hard and long when any other course would be a deception and a fraud.

This I think we do. We certainly try our best within our abilities. We know that otherwise we cannot hope for success.

In the long run, and very often in the short run, it is you citizens of this republic, acting directly through public opinion and through the Congress, who decide the contours of our policies and whether those policies shall go forward or waver and stop. We do our best to keep you informed and advised.

It rests in your courage and resolution and sacrifices to provide that national posture of steadiness and dependability which will make our country helpful, effective and respected in the community of nations.

For one further thing we look to you—for understanding of the complexity and volume of this work and for some part of your thought. The work of a foreign office does not consist solely of a few people pondering the great questions which you read about on the front pages of your newspapers. It consists also of an almost incredible number of programs and actions which must be carried out by a large number of people coordinated and directed toward our major ends.

It may surprise you to learn that last year the United States participated in 6,000 international meetings; that the Department of State received from its representatives in the field 340,000 reports—more than a thousand every working day—each of which had to be analyzed and its information brought to focus at the point of action. All of this cannot be made simple and understandable in capsule form. It takes work and thought not only by the devoted and loyal men and women who do this work, but also by the American people.

It is in these ways that we are trying to implement, in the field of foreign affairs, Al Smith's concept of the art of translating purpose into accomplishment.

We cannot do our job, any more than he could have done his, except in a frank and intimate relation with people outside of government. We do not ask, any more than he did, that this relationship be one of blind and unquestioning acceptance of all we think and do. When people agree with us, we want their support; when they do not, we want their frank and constructive criticism.

In either case, whether they agree or disagree with what we are doing, we hope they will regard us as ordinary American people, trying our best to do a job in a highly complicated set of circumstances and to do it in a way which Al Smith would have understood and approved.

Greek Citizens of Soviet Origin Deported to Soviet Central Asia

On October 17 the Department of State announced that it has confirmatory reports of the mass deportations of non-Russian elements from the Soviet Caucasus, which have been denounced by the Government of Greece. These deportations began in mid-June and included the forced migration of approximately 17 thousand Greeks as well as others in circumstances of extreme hardship.

Most of these persons were small-scale farmers, tradesmen, and artisans long established in the area. In mid-June they were suddenly, without warning or notification, removed from their homes and loaded on to cattle cars bound for the Republic of Kazakhstan in Soviet Central Asia. Reports state, for instance, that in the early morning hours of June 14, MVD (Soviet Secret Police) troops suddenly removed the entire population of foreign origin of the Caucasus town of Gagry, separating wives from their husbands and parents from their children. It is reported that one Greek woman was seized with her two small children in the middle of the night and embarked for the 2-week trip to Central Asia on an evacuee train containing no food or water. Her Russian husband was forced to stay behind. On arrival in Kazakhstan, according to other accounts, the forced migrants were simply deposited by the railroad siding without shelter or other elementary provision for their human requirements. They have since been scattered on various collective farms.

Reports indicate that the deportees are now living in small mud huts, called *zemlianki* in Russian, without light or fuel and plagued by fleas and mosquitoes. They are seriously undernourished and have received no clothing other than the light summer garments they were wearing when they left the mild climate of the Caucasus. The death rate is mounting and will become critical during the severe Russian winter unless conditions are improved. Meanwhile the deportees are forbidden to wander more than 5 miles from their concentration centers under threat of 20 years imprisonment.

The Soviet census of 1939 put the number of persons of Greek origin living in the U.S.S.R. at 285,896. Some of these are descendants of families established for generations in the Black Sea area of Russia; others migrated to the U.S.S.R. from Asia Minor after the First World War.

Many are Soviet citizens, but the repeated and unanswered Greek protests to the Soviet Government refer only to persons still claimed as Greek citizens.

U.S. Rejects Soviet Charges on Policy in Germany

[Released to the press October 17]

Following is the text of a note delivered on October 17, 1949, by the United States Embassy in Moscow to the Soviet Foreign Office in reply to the Soviet note regarding the West German Government:

The United States Government has received the note delivered to its Ambassador at Moscow by the Soviet Government on October 1, relating to the establishment of the German Federal Republic.

The United States Government does not deem it necessary to enter into a detailed discussion of the various charges set forth in the Soviet note. The attention of the Soviet Government is however invited to the public statement made by the Acting Secretary of State on October 6, of which a copy is attached for convenient reference.¹

The United States notes with incredulity that western action with regard to Germany is characterized as designed to convert Germany into a "drill ground," *place d'armes*, and center of disturbance in Europe. The United States Government recalls its systematic efforts to achieve the full demilitarization of Germany and its proposal of a four-power disarmament and demilitarization treaty, an offer repeatedly rejected by the Soviet Government. The United States Government also recalls in this connection the fact that there has been developed in the Soviet Zone of Germany a large, centralized police force, a police force moreover which is well equipped with military weapons and led by former German army officers.

The Government of the United States reaffirms its belief in the Potsdam principles which call for the democratization of Germany and the treatment of that country as an economic unity. It hopes that the time is not far distant when the Soviet Government instead of seeking to impose its arbitrary will upon the Germans of its zone will cooperate with the western Allies in enabling all the Germans of all Germany, within the framework prescribed by international agreements, to work out their common political destiny without dictation and with democratic freedom of action.

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 17, 1949, p. 590.

The Department of State: A Reflection of U.S. Leadership

by Deputy Under Secretary Peurifoy¹

These are difficult, even crucial, times, and the scale of action which they require of us as the leading nation of the free world is something all of us must think about clearly. It is no exaggeration whatever to say that the safety of the United States during the next decade rests more heavily upon the understanding its citizens will have of foreign affairs than it will upon battleships, planes, or atomic bombs.

The scale on which the Department of State must operate is a direct reflection of the role of leadership the United States has assumed in the world of today.

Let me tell you what this means in terms of facts and figures in the organization and administration end of the Department of State, which happens to be my bailiwick. The slow, steady increase of problems and responsibilities of the Department of State in its 160-year history was suddenly jolted by the turn of events that led us into the last war. In the brief span of years since then United States foreign relations have become so varied, so widespread, and so intense that the organization to handle them has gone through an unprecedented growth and a good deal of realignment.

Administrative Functions

Under my supervision are 4 offices and 18 divisions—all in Washington—made up of approximately 2,500 employees, or one-third of our entire departmental staff. Ten years ago the total staff of the Department in Washington was made up of 974 people. This low figure was due to the fact that the Department of State was the only one of the major executive agencies that had not experienced a big expansion during the depression years and the years just prior to the war. Today, we have about 13,000 foreign service personnel

located in areas throughout the world. About 5,000 of these are United States citizens. Ten years ago our foreign service staff totaled 3,966 people of whom about 1,600 were United States citizens.

Our many duties in organization and administration include employment, training, assignment, and transfer of personnel; budget justifications before Congress, budget allotments to departmental areas and foreign posts; security—the protection of classified material and the screening of personnel to protect against Communist infiltration; passports and visas; the administration of United States Government property abroad, and countless other functions.

All of these operations are essential to the successful running of any organization. Moreover the total organization must be so set up in order to perform its mission in the most efficient manner possible. As a consequence, while the Department was engaging in more and more functions, while its normal functions were being expanded and complicated by the increasing scope of our relationships with the world at large, it was undergoing periodic reorganizations calculated to increase operational efficiency.

We have just completed a rather basic change in the structure of our organization which has made for considerable streamlining of operations. This was the result of the Hoover Commission survey and especially the task-force study conducted under the leadership of Secretary Acheson. I had the pleasure of assisting in both the survey and putting the commission's recommendations into practice.

From the outline of the administrative functions that I have enumerated, you can imagine how complicated this housekeeping job can be. Even so, in directing it, it would be impossible not to become more and more involved in matters of program and policy. That is because the job must, of course, be geared to the goal our foreign policy is pursuing and the means we are taking to reach that goal.

¹ An address delivered before the Colleton County Press Association in Walterboro, S. C., on Oct. 24, 1949, and released to the press on the same date.

Scale of Action

I would like, then to tell you something of the scale of action that world conditions require of us. Let me go into this point by asking what is our goal, or, in other words, what is our foreign policy? There are those who say we have none. Well, the answer is not difficult to find. Reduced to its simplest form it is peace, peace and the protection of our freedom, and all that it means to us individually and collectively.

This goal finds its source in our people. It is motivated by your desire, mine and that of all other loyal Americans. That is why our foreign policy is a strong one; that is why our people have been willing to bear the burden of its cost.

We want peace, we want cooperation among governments, understanding among people. We have no ideas of aggrandizement at the expense of other countries. We have no territorial claims. We all know that America can no longer be isolated and self-supporting without serious complications and risks to national security. We couldn't isolate ourselves from World War I. It was impossible to stay out of the last World War. As communications and transportation bring people, even on opposite sides of the world, closer and closer together, cooperation and understanding become more and more important to self-preservation.

Now, if we situate our goal of peace in the context of postwar conditions we find that those conditions themselves have dictated to us the courses of action we are following in our leadership role. Let us look into some of the major foreign policy actions we are taking.

One of our principal actions is the Marshall Plan. Through the Economic Cooperation Administration we are giving aid and assistance to Western European countries, helping them recover from the last war. This action fits perfectly into the pattern of peace, freedom, and understanding.

Economic and Defensive Measures To Aid Europe

We were confronted with the hard fact of the inability of Western European nations to extricate themselves from the economic straits in which the destruction of war and the bleeding of prolonged occupation had left them. The chaos was too complete for them to cope with alone. That meant that people were living in conditions where they were the easy prey of the advocates of communism as the cure-all of economic ills. Physical weakness of nations made them easy targets for Communist infiltration which proved to be a very serious threat to national sovereignties. We had to take the lead and throw our economic weight into the balance. The results have not been 100

percent perfect. There is still much room for economic improvement. But one point that cannot be overstressed is that as a result of ERP free countries have been able to strengthen themselves internally and the grip of communism on the peoples has been broken, or at least loosened. Internal security is now reflected in greater efforts toward economic revival.

Our adherence to the North Atlantic pact—a truly unprecedented event in United States diplomatic history—and our parallel program of military assistance to free nations support another corner of our policy structure for peace.

Both these measures are defensive and in direct response to the record of postwar Soviet expansionism and the aggression of international communism. The North Atlantic Treaty joins together in defensive alliance the free nations of the North Atlantic community under the concept that an attack on one is an attack on all. It advances the cause of peace by making the price of aggression, any aggression from any quarter, so high that it becomes impractical. The idea of mutual aid and self-help that is the basis of the pact is the foundation stone of the military assistance program. Under this measure we are continuing to strengthen Greece and Turkey against overt Communist pressure, and we are helping our partners in the pact create a defense mechanism backed with real power.

Thus, we firmly believe that these actions fit the pattern of peace. They testify to our sincerity and they establish evidence immediately to the peoples of Western Europe and the rest of the world that we support peace and intend to back up those nations that share our desire for peace.

Support of the United Nations

Another major action that is fundamental to our foreign policy is our unflagging support of the United Nations. As a matter of fact, President Truman listed this as the first point in our foreign program in his inaugural address last January. You will recall that we decided, even before the war was over, that the concept of international cooperation that had proved so successful in winning the war should be the basis of postwar efforts toward peace.

As a consequence, we were prime movers at the San Francisco conference out of which the United Nations was born. We subscribe wholeheartedly to the basic purposes and principles of the United Nations which, incidentally, coincide directly with our own basic policy. Just take a look at article 1 of the United Nations Charter. It opens with these words:

The Purposes of the United Nations are: 1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, . . .

Today the United Nations is 4 years old. To some it has been a disappointment. But this

should not be so. A look at the record will show that even in spite of the almost insurmountable obstacles with which it has been faced it has given a good account of itself. For a 4-year-old organization it can point to some very remarkable achievements, principally in the social and economic fields. Furthermore, it has gained four precious years of experience as an effective mechanism for handling some of the most intricate international business.

Those who are disappointed in the United Nations point to the Security Council as an example of United Nations failure. Here, indeed, the United Nations has not succeeded as well as had been hoped. The unpleasant truth is that it has been prevented from achieving success in this field because the big-power cooperation that was essential to success did not materialize. Instead there is a long, sad record of Soviet obstruction—misuse of the veto in security matters. But even in spite of this, the United Nations has demonstrated to the world that it can be an effective force for the preservation of peace. It demonstrated that fact in several international disputes that might have developed into widespread warfare. There was the Palestine question, where United Nations mediation brought peace; Iran, from which Soviet troops were refusing to withdraw according to treaty obligations; Korea, where a new republic was established as a result of free elections held under the auspices of the United Nations; there was the "cease-fire" in Indonesia which has given both sides an opportunity to work out their difficulties; likewise, in the Kashmir the United Nations successfully brought about a cease-fire order and is now arranging a plebiscite to settle the jurisdictional dispute between India and Pakistan.

Above and beyond these specific accomplishments both the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations exert a tremendous effect on world opinion and its moral force. It is well established as an international forum in which differences can be aired by contending parties and their merits adjudged by the world at large.

Unquestionably the Security Council debate on the Berlin question had a bearing on the lifting of the blockade. It is important to remember, too, that contact between the Soviets and the Western powers was reestablished in this matter by United Nations delegates and on United Nations ground.

Problem of Aggressive Communism

I hope I have not conveyed to you the idea that the pursuit of our foreign aims is a simple matter. The contrary is true. One thing, however, that must have struck you in this discussion is that to a large extent our scale of action has been compli-

cated by Soviet policy. It is certain that the economic revival of Western Europe would have been much easier without internal communistic pressures inspired from abroad. It is equally certain that if the principles of the United Nations were adhered to by Soviet Russia there would be no need for the regional defense arrangements the free nations have been forced into making. In this connection, it is fortunate that the Charter of the United Nations made provisions for such regional defenses.

We recognize the major problem of the world as aggressive communism. There has been a somewhat reluctant realization of the problem it presents, its evil nature, and its relentless pursuit of its eventual goal of world domination.

Communism, in essence, is not merely a political or economic theory. It is a philosophical system, with its own concept of the nature of man, his rights, and his destiny. It is opposed in every respect to all the beliefs that have been the strength of our Western civilization. It believes that man is weak and unable to govern himself and so must be controlled by strong masters—that is the police state which employs some of the most ruthless methods of control this world has ever known. As you know, Christianity is not surviving in countries under Communist domination, and I tell you that both Christianity and communism cannot exist in the same world.

The forces of communism are employing these methods wherever they hold sway. The ill treatment of local nationals in Communist-dominated countries is unbelievable. Right now Czechoslovakia is being terrorized. The persecution of religious leaders is another example. Certain citizens of Communist-controlled countries who were employed by our embassies and those of other Western democratic countries have been subjected to insufferable treatment. Our own official staffs in many satellite countries undergo many unpleasant experiences. The people who go to these countries to do a job for this country deserve considerable credit.

In China, for example, our personnel in consulates that are being closed are being subjected to arrest and all sorts of other delays in efforts to return home. We know that they will get back eventually but the delays and other difficulties they are encountering are the full responsibility of the Government of Soviet Russia.

Our dealings with Russia are complicated further by the fact its representatives are never empowered to make decisions on their own. If a delicate negotiation goes off in a direction unforeseen by the masters of the Kremlin, Soviet representatives must go back to the Kremlin for further instructions.

Another difficulty with which we are faced and which is inherent in all dictatorships is that not only the Russian people but their government, too, are not aware of the true facts concerning us. Agents of the Kremlin cannot report true facts.

They must, for their own salvation, report what their rulers want to hear.

In the last war, those who heard German propaganda broadcasts aimed at undermining the morale of our troops were only amused at what they heard. The errors and stupidity of Goebbel's organization were laughable. Russian propaganda is no better, but it does have an effect on the Russian people. For instance, Russian listeners were told recently that the news of the Russian atomic explosion created panic among the American people. They weren't told that our people were somewhat more concerned with the outcome of the World Series.

We are making a considerable effort through the United States Information Service, operating under the direction of the Department of State, to get the truth across to the Russians as well as to the rest of the world. The people of Russia like those of the satellite nations realize that the only news they are permitted to receive is controlled by their government. Many of them risk im-

prisonment to listen to our radio broadcasts. This alarms the Soviet Government which is employing scores of radio transmitters to "jam" our programs.

This problem of communism that we are confronting is something without exact parallel in history. We have no blueprints to follow, no pat procedures of demonstrated value to use. We are relying on our judgment, our national moral integrity, and on our faith in the justness of our cause. We have had to improvise, and our improvisations have worked. We haven't solved the problem, but we have made considerable progress. We have effectively checked the spread of communism in Europe; we are building a workable economic structure as well as an effective defense force among our friends in Europe. We have the initiative, and we are constantly pressing it. We are not alarmed by the atomic development in Russia, but we realize that we must remain strong and in that way maintain peace until the Soviet Government accepts what we believe to be true—that permanent peace is possible even with differing economic systems—and that all concerned can and must get along together for the benefit of all.

Trading Ideas With the World

EDUCATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION RELEASES THIRD REPORT

Released to the press October 23

"Genuine understanding and mutual respect and confidence which result from trading ideas with the world are as important to national security as economic aid and military preparedness," Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chairman of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, stated today in making public the Commission's third quarterly report¹ to the Secretary of State.

This is the first comprehensive review of all United States Government activities in the field of educational and technical exchange under the International Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Congress). The Commission's report urges that this country's exchange program under that act which

has been limited largely to the Latin American countries, be placed on a broad-scale basis throughout the world without further delay. It also presents a series of major policy recommendations to the Secretary designed to increase the effectiveness of the programs.

Throughout the report emphasis is given to the role of private organizations in achieving international understanding through educational exchange.

In his statement announcing submission of the report to the Secretary, Chairman Branscomb said:

"While present unfavorable circumstances force us to devote a major share of our efforts to maintain large scale armaments, we must not lose sight of the fact that the atom bomb will never win the peace, nor in the long run prevent war. Enduring peace and prosperity will be achieved only

¹ *Trading Ideas With the World*, Department of State publication 3551, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. for 55¢.

when peoples know that they have common interests and concerns, understand each other, and work together harmoniously toward common goals. I believe that this is the number one fact of international life today. It is the humanizing factor in the conduct of international relations. The program of trading ideas with the world, which is now only in its infancy, is doing more than anything else to make foreign affairs everyone's affairs."

The Commission was established by Public Law 402 to insure public participation in this peoples-to-peoples program of international educational and technical exchange. Its members were appointed by President Truman in July 1948, each representing an important segment of the American public in the educational, cultural, scientific, technical, and public service fields. They are:

Chairman

Harvie Branscomb, chancellor, Vanderbilt University

Vice Chairman

Mark Starr, educational director, International Ladies Garment Workers Union

Members

Harold Willis Dodds, president, Princeton University
Edwin B. Fred, President, University of Wisconsin
(Replaces Karl T. Compton who resigned upon his appointment as head of the Research and Development Board)

Martin R. P. McGuire, professor, Catholic University

The report cites many specific examples of the effectiveness of the educational exchange and technical cooperation activities of the Department of State and the other United States Government agencies participating in the program. Typical of the achievements listed is the work of three American geologists in Brazil who in cooperation with Brazilian geologists have discovered nearly 25 million tons of strategically important manganese ore deposits.

Also cited is the work of a fisheries mission whose assistance to the Government of Mexico has been instrumental in more than doubling the commercial fisheries' production during the past few years. This will increase the United States and Mexican food supply.

Similarly remarkable achievements are cited in public health, education, and other key fields.

Recommendations which the Commission made to the Secretary deal with issues of great concern to public leaders—exchanges with Iron Curtain countries, United States financial assistance to destitute foreign students, the proposal to use Finnish war debt payments for an educational-exchange program, the negotiations of international cultural agreements, short-term study projects for American students, and the effect of immigration laws and regulations on exchange-of-

persons programs. With respect to this last problem, the Commission's independent findings and recommendations were of concrete assistance in determining the content of new regulations later issued by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State.

The first section of the 88-page document reports on the entire range of the educational and technical exchange programs—the Department's work here and abroad to aid unofficial exchanges; the scientific and technical projects, the activities of the United States libraries overseas, the operations of the binational cultural institutes, the program for aiding American-sponsored schools abroad; book exhibits and exchange; translation programs; the exchange of professors, specialists, teachers, and students.

The second half of the report deals with the total program by activity and by each country where conducted.

Fulbright Exchange Opportunities Announced

[Released to the press October 11]

Opportunities for 648 Americans to undertake graduate study, teaching or research abroad during the 1950-51 academic year under the terms of the Fulbright Act were announced today by the Department of State. A comparable number of opportunities will be available for foreign nationals to come to the United States for similar purposes. The countries in which these opportunities will be available are Belgium, Luxembourg, Burma, Greece, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, and France.

Competition for awards will open on October 15 and close on December 1. Persons wishing to apply should send their inquiries to the following agencies:

For graduate study: Persons now enrolled in American colleges and universities should apply to the Fulbright Program Advisers on their campuses. Others should apply directly to the Institute of International Education, 2 West 45th Street, New York 19, N.Y.

For university teaching, or advanced research: to the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington 25, D.C.

For teaching in American secondary schools abroad: to the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington 25, D.C.

For teaching in national secondary schools abroad: to the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Washington 25, D. C.

Additional exchanges in 1950-51 will be carried out in Italy, Norway, and Iran. The number of grants available in these countries will be an-

nounced later, and applications will not be accepted until such announcement is made.

These awards are made under Public Law 584, 79th Congress, the Fulbright Act, which authorizes the Department of State to use certain foreign currencies and credits acquired through the sale of surplus property abroad for programs of educational exchange with other nations. Grants are normally made for 1 academic year and are renewable only in exceptional cases. Grants to Americans usually include round trip transportation, tuition or a stipend, a living allowance, and a small amount for necessary books and equipment. Grants to foreign nationals include round-trip transportation only, and their expenses in the United States must be met from other sources. All grants under the act are made in foreign currencies.

Opportunities in each country are listed below:

Belgium and Luxembourg: 22 American graduate students to study in Belgian universities; 1 American teacher to teach English conversation and American civilization at a lycee in Brussels; 1 American professor to teach American literature and civilization at a Belgian university; 2 travel grants to American professors for a direct exchange with Belgian professors; 2 American research scholars for research in Belgium or the Belgian Congo. Travel grants to the United States for nationals of Belgium and Luxembourg are offered to: 5 professors or research scholars; 1 primary or secondary school teacher; and 21 students.

Burma: 3 American graduate students to study in Burmese universities; 1 teacher of general science for the Central State High School; 12 professors to teach at the University of Rangoon, the State Training College for Teachers, the University College at Mandalay, the Agricultural Teachers' Training School at Taunggyi, the Post-Primary School at Myitkyina, and the American Medical Center at Namkham, in such fields as geography, geology, physical education, educational psychology, agriculture, orthopedic surgery, zoology, and medicine; 2 research scholars in such fields as education and social science for research at the State Training College for Teachers and the University of Rangoon. Travel grants will be offered for 25 Burmese nationals to come to the United States; and 60 awards will be offered to Burmese nurses for training at the American Medical Center.

Greece: 12 American graduate students; 18 primary or secondary school teachers to teach English, music, science, physical education and other subjects at Athens College, Anatolia College, Pierce College, American Farm School, and the YMCA and YWCA Training Schools; 4 professors, 1 to teach American life and civilization at the Uni-

versity of Athens, 1 to teach rural sociology at the Superior School of Agriculture, and 2 for teaching assignments not yet specified; 6 research scholars. Travel grants will be available to 8 Greek professors or research scholars and 20 students. 257 scholarships will be provided for Greek students to attend American-sponsored schools in Greece.

Netherlands: 25 American graduate students; 8 primary or secondary school teachers to teach history, education of the blind, and of the deaf and dumb, sport physiology, dietetics, social casework, and other general subjects; 10 professors to teach the following subjects: international law and astronomy at the University of Leiden, dentistry at the University of Utrecht, nuclear physics at the University of Groningen, sociology at the Municipal University of Amsterdam, linguistics at the University of Nijmegen, dogma and New Testament at the Vrije Universiteit at Amsterdam, supersonics at the Technical Institute at Delft, plant physiology at the Agricultural College at Wageningen, business efficiency at the Economic College of Rotterdam or Tilburg; 2 research scholars in the fields of chemical technology and biochemistry to conduct research at the Technical Institute at Delft and the University of Utrecht. Travel grants will be available for 5 Netherlands professors or research scholars and 80 students and teachers.

New Zealand: 10 American graduate students; 2 primary or secondary school teachers to teach in New Zealand schools; 2 professors and 2 research scholars. Travel grants will be available for 16 New Zealand nationals to come to the United States.

Philippines: 6 American graduate students; 1 professor and 14 secondary school teachers to teach at the Philippine School of Arts and Trades in various aspects of vocational education; 2 research scholars. Travel grants will be available for 40 Philippine nationals to come to the United States.

United Kingdom: Opportunities are offered both in Great Britain and in the colonial dependencies. For Great Britain: 153 American graduate students; 40 professors and research scholars. For the colonial dependencies: 13 American graduate students, professors, or research scholars. Travel grants will be available for 192 persons from Great Britain, and for 13 citizens of the colonial dependencies. In addition, partial travel grants will be awarded to 250 British and American teachers participating in the Anglo-American teacher interchange program.

France: 220 American graduate students; 13 primary or secondary school teachers; 10 professors, 3 in the field of American literature and civilization, 1 in mathematics, 1 in sociology, 1 in chemical engineering, and 4 unspecified; 29 research scholars. Travel grants will be available for 272 French citizens to come to the United States.

THE DEPARTMENT

Reorganization of the Department of State

[Released to the press October 4]

Effective October 3, 1949, the political, economic, and international organization work of the Department of State was reorganized in accordance with the Department's plan of reorganization which is based on the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government and the Department's reorganization Task Force Number 2.¹

The following Bureaus under the supervision of the Under Secretary are as follows:

Bureau of Inter-American Affairs (ARA), under the direction of Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary

Bureau of European Affairs (EUR), under the direction of George W. Perkins, Assistant Secretary

Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs (FE), under the direction of W. Walton Butterworth, Assistant Secretary

Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs (NEA), under the direction of George C. McGhee, Assistant Secretary

Bureau of United Nations Affairs (UNA), under the direction of John D. Hickerson, Assistant Secretary

The Offices of European Affairs (EUR), American Republics Affairs (ARA), Near East and African Affairs (NEA), Far Eastern Affairs (FE), and United Nations Affairs (UNA) and their constituent divisions, except the Division of International Conferences, were abolished and the functions, personnel, and records of each were transferred respectively to the new Bureau having corresponding jurisdiction.

The Office of Transportation and Communications (TRC) was transferred to the direction of Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs.

The constituent divisions of the Offices of International Trade Policy (ITP), Financial and Development Policy (OFD), and Transport and Communications (TRC) will henceforth be known as policy staffs.

The Bureau of Inter-American Affairs (ARA) was organized as follows:

Office of the Assistant Secretary (ARA)
Office of East Coast Affairs (EC)

Office of North and West Coast Affairs (NWC)
Office of Middle American Affairs (MID)
Office of Regional-American Affairs (RA)

The Bureau of European Affairs (EUR) was organized as follows:

Office of the Assistant Secretary (EUR)
Office of British Commonwealth and Northern European Affairs (BNA)
Office of Eastern European Affairs (EE)
Office of Western European Affairs (WE)
Office of European Regional Bureau Affairs (RA)

The Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs (FE) was organized as follows:

Office of the Assistant Secretary (FE)
Office of Chinese Affairs (CA)
Office of Northeast Asia Affairs (NA)
Office of Philippine and Southeast Asia Affairs (PSA)

The Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs (NEA) was organized as follows:

Office of the Assistant Secretary (NEA)
Office of Greek-Turkish-Iranian Affairs (GTI)
Office of African and Near Eastern Affairs (ANE)
Office of South Asian Affairs (SOA)

The Bureau of United Nations Affairs (UNA) was organized as follows:

Office of the Assistant Secretary (UNA)
Office of International Administration and Conferences (IAC)
Office of United Nations Economic and Social Affairs (UNE)
Office of Dependent-Area Affairs (UND)
Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs (UNP)

The Division of International Conferences was transferred to the new Office of International Administration and Conferences. The International Administration Staff now in the Office of United Nations Affairs is constituted as the Division of International Administration in the Office of International Administration and Conferences.

The specific transfer of responsibilities to the Regional Bureaus with respect to economic, intelligence, and public affairs work, and the designation of the principal officers in each of the new or reorganized organizational units will be announced shortly.

The Bureau of European Affairs consists of the following organizational units under the supervision of the designated officers:

Assistant Secretary for European Affairs.	
Deputy Assistant Secretary for European Affairs.	Llewellyn E. Thompson
Executive Director	Arthur G. Stevens
Adviser, UN	G. Hayden Raynor
Special Assistant	Raymond E. Murphy
Labor Adviser	To be announced later
Intelligence Adviser	To be announced later
Staff Assistant	Boies C. Hart, Jr.

Office of British Commonwealth and Northern European Affairs (BNA):

Director	Henry R. Labouisse
Deputy Director	Livingston Satterthwaite
Officer in Charge, United Kingdom and Ireland Affairs.	Wayne G. Jackson

¹ BULLETINS of June 26, 1949, p. 835; May 29, 1949, p. 702; and Mar. 13, 1949, p. 333.

Officer in Charge, Dominion Affairs. William P. Snow
 Officer in Charge, Northern European Affairs. Benjamin M. Hulley
 Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs. To be announced later

Office of Eastern European Affairs (EE):

Director ----- G. Frederick Reinhardt (Acting)
 Deputy Director ----- To be announced later
 Officer in Charge, U.S.S.R. Affairs. G. Frederick Reinhardt
 Officer in Charge, Balkan Affairs. John C. Campbell (Acting)
 Officer in Charge, Poland, Baltic and Czechoslovakian Affairs. Fred K. Salter
 Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs. To be announced later

Office of Western European Affairs (WE):

Director ----- Theodore C. Achilles
 Deputy Director ----- Homer M. Byington
 Officer in Charge, Italian Affairs. Leonard Unger (Acting)
 Officer in Charge, French-Iberian Affairs. Elim O'Shaughnessy
 Officer in Charge, Swiss-Benelux Affairs. Frederick E. Nolting
 Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs. Roswell H. Whitman

Office of European Regional Affairs (RA):

Director ----- Edwin M. Martin
 Deputy Director ----- Douglas MacArthur, II
 Officer in Charge, Economic Organization Affairs. Ben T. Moore
 Officer in Charge, Special Problems Affairs. To be announced later
 Officer in Charge, Public Affairs. Antonio A. Micocci (Acting)

The Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs consists of the following organizational units under the supervision of the designated officers:

Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs. George C. McGhee
 Deputy Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs. Raymond A. Hare
 Executive Director ----- John W. Jago
 Intelligence Adviser ----- W. Wendell Cleland
 Labor Adviser ----- William J. Handley
 Politico-Economic Adviser ----- Henry L. Deimel, Jr.
 Politico-Military Adviser ----- David A. Robertson
 Refugee Adviser ----- Arthur Z. Gardiner
 United Nations Adviser ----- Harry N. Howard
 Staff Assistant ----- Alton W. Hemba

Office of Greek, Turkish and Iranian Affairs (GTI):

Director ----- John D. Jernegan
 Deputy Director ----- William M. Rountree
 Officer in Charge, Greek Affairs. Leonard J. Cromie
 Officer in Charge, Turkish Affairs. C. Robert Moore
 Officer in Charge, Iranian Affairs. C. Vaughan Ferguson

Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs. To be announced later

Office of South Asian Affairs (SOA):

Director ----- Elbert G. Mathews
 Deputy Director ----- Donald D. Kennedy
 Officer in Charge, India-Nepal Affairs. Joseph S. Sparks
 Officer in Charge, Pakistan-Afghanistan Affairs. Thomas Elliot Well
 Officer in Charge, Burma-Ceylon Affairs. Richard E. Usher
 Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs. To be announced later

Office of African and Near Eastern Affairs (ANE):

Director ----- To be announced later
 Deputy Director ----- Gordon H. Mattison
 Deputy Director ----- James S. Moose, Jr.
 Officer in Charge, Lebanon-Syria-Iraq Affairs. Harlan P. Clark
 Officer in Charge, Palestine-Israel-Jordan Affairs. Fraser Wilkins
 Officer in Charge, Arabian Peninsula Affairs. Richard H. Sanger
 Officer in Charge, Egypt and Anglo-Egyptian Sudan Affairs. Wells Stabler
 Officer in Charge, Northern Africa Affairs. Samuel K. C. Kopper
 Officer in Charge, Southern Africa Affairs. Leo G. Cyr
 Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs. To be announced later

The organizational units under the Bureaus of Inter-American Affairs, Far Eastern Affairs and United Nations Affairs will be announced at a later date.

Bureau of Inter-American Affairs

[Released to the press October 11]

The Department of State announced today that effective October 3, 1949, the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs (ARA) was established under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs.

The Bureau consists of the following organizational units under the supervision of the designated officers:

Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. Edward G. Miller, Jr.
 Deputy Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. Willard F. Barber
 Executive Director. William P. Hughes
 Economic and Labor Adviser. Ivan B. White

The Intelligence adviser and the Public Affairs Adviser will be named at a later date

Staff Assistant ----- Norman M. Pearson

Office of Middle American Affairs (MID)

Director ----- Paul J. Reveley
 Deputy Director ----- Edward G. Cale
 Special Assistant ----- Thomas C. Mann

Officer in Charge, Mexican Affairs.....	Paul J. Reveley
Officer in Charge, Central America and Panama Affairs.....	Murray M. Wise (Acting)
Officer in Charge, Caribbean Affairs.....	Leonard H. Price (Acting)

Office of East Coast Affairs (EC)

Director	Howard H. Tewksbury
Officer in Charge, Brazilian Affairs.....	DuWayne Clark
Officer in Charge, River Plate Affairs.....	Rollin S. Atwood

Office of North and West Coast Affairs (NWC)

Director	Sheldon T. Mills
Officer in Charge, North Coast Affairs, (Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador).....	William L. Krieg
Officer in Charge, West Coast Affairs, (Chile, Bolivia, Peru).....	Harold M. Randall

Office of Regional American Affairs (RA)

Director	John C. Dreier
----------------	----------------

Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs

[Released to the press October 13]

Effective October 3, 1949, the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs (FE) was established under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs.

The Bureau consists of the following organizational units under the supervision of the designated officers:

Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs.....	W. Walton Butterworth
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs.....	Livingston T. Merchant
Executive Director.....	William D. Wright, Jr.
Intelligence Adviser.....	Cyrus Peake
Labor Adviser.....	Philip B. Sullivan
Economic Adviser.....	Merrill C. Gay
United Nations Adviser.....	Ruth E. Bacon
Staff Assistant.....	To be announced later

Office of Chinese Affairs (CA)

Director.....	Phillip D. Sprouse
Deputy Director.....	Fulton Freeman, Acting
Officer in Charge, Political Affairs.....	Troy L. Perkins
Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs.....	Robert W. Barnett

Office of Northeast Asian Affairs (NA)

Director.....	John M. Allison
Deputy Director.....	U. Alexis Johnson

Officer in Charge, Japan and Soviet Far East Affairs.....	Harold W. Moseley
Officer in Charge, Korea Affairs.....	Niles W. Bond
Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs.....	Edward M. Doherty

Office of Philippine and Southeast Asian Affairs (PSA)

Director.....	Charles S. Reed
Deputy Director.....	Richard R. Ely
Officer in Charge, Thai, Malayan and Indochinese Affairs.....	Kenneth P. Landon
Officer in Charge, Indonesian and Pacific Island Affairs.....	William S. B. Lacy
Officer in Charge, Philippine Affairs.....	John F. Melby
Officer in Charge, Economic Affairs.....	Charles J. Shohan

Public Affairs

Officer in Charge.....	Bradford Connors
------------------------	------------------

Address Before International Surgery Meeting

On October 10 H. Walton Butterworth, Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, made an address before the International Society of Surgery, which group was holding its meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana. The text of Mr. Butterworth's remarks was issued as Department of State press release 776 of October 10.

Correction to Report on Military Assistance to Foreign Countries

In the BULLETIN of September 26, 1949, pages 480 and 481, under heading C, the first two paragraphs should read as follows:

C. TRANSFERS FROM GOVERNMENT STOCKS UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT

The President, acting under his plenary powers of Chief Executive and Commander-in-Chief, for the purpose of protecting primary security interests of the United States, authorized the transfer of military supplies and equipment from United States Government stocks to France and Italy. The transfer to France under this authority consisted of certain ordnance, quartermaster, signal and engineer items. In addition a small quantity of new equipment was procured for the French program.

The transfer to Italy consisted of small quantities of military equipment and supplies, primarily, ordnance and signal equipment, which were needed to complete the re-equipment of Italian security forces which had been re-armed mainly with surplus Allied material in Italy. In authorizing this transfer, the limitations imposed upon Italy by the treaty of peace were scrupulously observed.

Contents

The United Nations and Specialized Agencies

Working in the U.N.—A Challenge to Better Human Relations. Address by President Truman	643
U.S. Urges System of Verification in Control of International Armaments. Statement by Ambassador Warren R. Austin . . .	649
The United Nations and American Security. By Deputy Under Secretary Rusk . . .	652
Conciliation Committee Suspends Activities. Letter from the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of Committee I	657
Repatriation of Greek Children	658
Debate on Violation of Human Rights in Eastern Europe Continued. Statement by Benjamin V. Cohen	659
The United States in the United Nations . .	662

General Policy

Greek Guerrillas Cease Activities. Statement by Secretary Acheson	658
Effective International Cooperation Through the Organization of American States: Statement by President Truman	664
Reply to the President by Ambassador Joseph D. Charles	664
Conclusions of the Inter-American Peace Committee With Reference to the Situation in the Caribbean	665
Problems in American Foreign Policy. By Secretary Acheson	668
Greek Citizens of Soviet Origin Deported to Soviet Central Asia	670
The Department of State: A Reflection of U.S. Leadership. By Deputy Under Secretary Peurifoy	671

Economic Affairs

What Does International Standardization Mean to the United States? By Joseph A. Greenwald	646
---	-----

International Organizations and Conferences

U.S. Delegations:	
Military Medicine and Pharmacy Congress	667
ILO: Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees	667

Occupation Matters

U.S. Rejects Soviet Charges on Policy in Germany	670
--	-----

International Information and Cultural Affairs

Fulbright Exchange Opportunities Announced	675
--	-----

The Department

The Department of State: A Reflection of U.S. Leadership. By Deputy Under Secretary Peurifoy	671
Reorganization of the Department of State . .	677
Bureau of Inter-American Affairs	678
Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs	679

Publications

Trading Ideas With the World: Educational Advisory Commission Releases Third Report	674
---	-----